

AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

VOL. XLII, 3.

WHOLE No. 167.

I.—CHANSONS DE GESTE AND THE HOMERIC PROBLEM.

In 1795 when Wolf published his "Prolegomena" and thus first called to the attention of scholars the problem as to the origin and composition of the Iliad and the Odyssey, the Old French epic poems, known generally as "chansons de geste," had been forgotten for centuries. But almost as soon as the manuscripts of these poems began to be noticed, their similarity in form and matter to the Greek epos was at once apparent. It was a classical scholar, Immanuel Bekker, who in 1829 published the first edition of a chanson de geste, the Provençal "Fierabras." Bekker instituted later a detailed comparison¹ between Homeric and Old French customs, culture and modes of expression. A similar comparison was made by Littré² in France, who in 1841 went so far as to translate into the language and meter of the chansons the first book of the Iliad, an interesting, if not very successful, *tour de force*. Since then almost every Homeric critic has cited the chansons, and their evidence has been adduced on both sides of the century-old controversy, by the "unitarians" as well as by the "chorizontes," by Lang and Drerup as well as by Cauver and Gilbert Murray. But generally these comparisons have been made without intimate and extensive knowledge of the vast mass of epic material contained in the Old French manuscripts. Murray, for instance, relies entirely on G. Paris' "Manuel" and small edition of the *Chanson de Roland*, Lang on Gautier's "Epo-

¹ I. Bekker, Vergleichung homerischer und altfranzoesischer Sitten, in Monatsber. d. Berl. Akad. d. Wiss., 1866, and, Homerische Ansichten und Ausdrucksweisen mit altfranzoesischen zusammengestellt, ibid., 1867.

² E. Littré, La poésie homérique et l'ancienne poésie française, in Rev. des deux mondes, 1847; reprinted in: Histoire de la langue française, 1862, I, 301ff.

pées," Drerup on Rajna's "Origini." So it seems to me that a comparison from the other viewpoint may not be without interest to classical scholars. In the following pages then I intend to indicate and discuss some analogies between the Greek and the French epics, from the standpoint of a student of the latter. I shall by no means indicate all the parallels that might be drawn. That would be an almost endless task, especially in matters of social and institutional history, modes of thought and expression. My design now is to illustrate certain moot points of Homeric criticism by materials taken from the chansons de geste.

In the last thirty years the critical study of Homer has been greatly modified by the discovery of new archaeological and anthropological evidence. The excavations in Troy, Mycenae and Crete have proved that there existed, at a time preceding the traditional date of the Trojan War, a rich and well developed civilization. Homer's description of the wealth and power of Mycenae and Troy now seems, if anything, to be inferior to the reality. At the same time closer investigation of the cults of ancient Greece has disclosed the existence of a mass of beliefs, rites and customs unknown to, or ignored by, Homer. There has been likewise a shifting of views in regard to the evolution and composition of the poems. Lachmann's "Kleinlieder" theory is almost entirely given up. While the majority of the critics cling to the Wolfian hypothesis to the extent that it presupposes a long, traditional "Vorgeschichte" to the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, I suppose that few of them would now care to deny that at some stage of the process a great poet was at work, shaping and transforming, by his own genius, the legendary material. Nor, on the other hand, do "Unitarians" like Lang and Drerup deny the possibility of interpolations and reworkings, to a limited extent, of the original poems. The present problem, I take it, is this: whether or not the Homeric poems are the result of a long process of evolution, and whether the different "strata" or moments of that evolution can be distinguished in the poems themselves. A secondary but related problem is that of the credibility of the poems in respect to the cultural and political history contained in them. For both these questions we find abundant illustrative analogies in the chansons de geste.

The later poems in their turn occupy by no means the position they once filled in the eyes of the student of epic origins. Till the days when M. Joseph Bédier published his epoch-making "*Légendes épiques*," we were all, more or less, convinced that the chansons likewise were the final product of a long, but hidden, process of development. Going back to traditions or sagas, in verse form or otherwise, contemporaneous with the events they record, they had, in the course of the ages, dropped or distorted their original kernels of historic truth, incorporated disparate elements of various provenance, undergone constant rehandling, interpolation and excision, all by oral transmission, till finally, in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, they were fixed in writing in the form we now possess.³ It is, I think, safe to say that M. Bédier's brilliant criticism has not left one stone of this theoretical edifice standing. There is absolutely no trustworthy evidence that an epic tradition about Charlemagne and the heroes associated with him existed in France prior to 1050 A. D.⁴ Whether the positive results of M. Bédier's investigations, the dependence of the authors of the chansons on the "clercs" of the pilgrim shrines and routes, are equally certain, I do not purpose here to inquire. For my comparisons I intend to accept fully his main contention: the French epics were "*nées au XI^e siècle seulement; nous les possédons en des versions identiques ou fort ressemblantes aux versions originales.*" For the purposes of this paper I shall go even farther than M. Bédier; I shall not assume the existence of any lost versions whatsoever, except in so far as study of the rimes shows copying, though I believe that in some cases they undoubtedly existed. It is ill arguing from one unknown to another unknown. The unknown quantity in the Homeric problem is the material — myths, history, ballads, long poems, prose sagas, or what not—that lies behind the preserved *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. So I assume no unknown material at all behind the French epics. I simply take what is preserved in them, and I then

³ This theory has been stated most fully in the various works of the late G. Paris; see also Rajna, *passim*, and Voretzsch, *Einführung*, pp. 108-136, 195-257.

⁴ For Bédier's unanswered criticism of the texts previously adduced in favor of the older theory, see *Lég. ép.* I, 171ff., II, 349ff., III, 195ff., IV, 289ff.

proceed to question this known quantity as to how it may elucidate the unknown quantity in the Greek epos.

The epic material in Old French is contained in about ninety chansons, ranging in length from a few hundred to twenty thousand or more verses. These chansons are preserved in manuscripts of various date, none of which however goes back farther than the second half of the twelfth century. Criteria of language and historical allusions enable us to fix the date of composition of most of the versions of which our manuscripts are copies. It is a conservative estimate to say that the earliest chansons were composed in the first years of the twelfth century, the latest before the middle of the fourteenth.* The manuscripts are in most cases somewhat later. For instance, *Aiquin*, a poem of the twelfth century, is preserved only in one manuscript of the fifteenth. For each chanson, we possess from one to thirteen manuscript copies, often differing considerably from one another in respect to dialect, wording and details of narrative. There was, furthermore, a constant tendency to group the songs together in cycles or "gestes" dealing with the same hero or family of heroes.⁶ In such matters as versification, style, vocabulary and "atmosphere," our poems are remarkably homogeneous. The legendary events narrated in them are associated with Charlemagne or his immediate predecessors or successors (with a few exceptions),⁷ being thus, as with Homer, supposed to occur in a distant and heroic past when men were mightier than they are now. The general theme of all is either the national and religious struggle against the Saracen, or else the strife of the feudal nobles with the kings or with one another.⁸ It will be seen from this brief recapitulation how vast a mass of epic material we have pre-

* Formerly it was thought that the *Roland*, the *Pèlerinage de Charlemagne*, possibly also *Gormont et Isembart*, dated from 1070-1090, but now opinion is tending to the belief that no chanson is earlier than the First Crusade (1096-1099).

⁶ This cyclic tendency went farthest in the case of the "geste de Guillaume" and the short "geste des Lorrains;" the others are artificial.

⁷ Exceptions are: the "cycle de la Croisade," *Floovant*, of which the hero is a supposed Merovingian, and *Hugues Capet*, late and unhistorical.

⁸ Typical poems in each of these classes are: *Roland*, *Renaut de Montauban*, *Raoul de Cambrai*.

served in the chansons de geste. Now let us see what parallels they present to the Homeric poems.

In the first place, in matters of text and language, it is at once apparent that the chansons represent a stage anterior to that of the Homeric vulgate. The text of all of them is remarkably fluid, subject as it was to the whims of each successive copyist or "remanieur." The variants in the MS tradition are more numerous and more serious than is the case for Homer. Take for instance one of the least altered chansons, *Aymeri de Narbonne* (4708 lines, early thirteenth century). We possess of this song five manuscripts, which agree in only 281 verses of the first thousand. Moreover, as compared with the critical text, MS A¹ shows a *plus* of 21 and a *minus* of 20 full lines, MS A² a *plus* of 37 and a *minus* of 33, MS B¹ a *plus* of 19 and a *minus* of 126, MS B² a *plus* of 25 and a *minus* of 125. In most cases, the proportion of variant or redundant lines is far greater than this. For example, *Hervi de Metz*, a late chanson, without "traditional" elements, is preserved in three manuscripts. Of these, MSS T and N have long interpolations in the middle and at the end of the poem. Besides, in the first thousand lines, without long interpolations, the three MSS agree absolutely in only 11 lines; and T shows a *plus* of 26, a *minus* of 3, N, a *plus* of 84 and a *minus* of 18, E, a *plus* of 54 and a *minus* of 55. This will suffice, I think, to show the fluidity of the textual tradition. In the case of the older chansons like *Roland*, *Aliscans*, *Renaut de Montauban* and others, the interpolations and changes are much more numerous. I shall discuss some of them more fully when I come to consider the possibility of multiple composition or reworking.

As compared then with the vulgate Homer, our chansons show an extremely "fluid" text, somewhat like, for example, that presented by some of the papyrus manuscripts of Homer lately discovered in Egypt.* The difference is easily explainable. None of the French epics ever became a public and national "bible," none (till nineteenth-century scholars got hold of them) was worked over by scholars interested in their text. The chansons have in their past no Aristarchus, no Zenodotus, not even a Pisistratus (be it said with all due reserve as to the question of a "Pisistratean redaction"). They are then

* See Cauer, 27ff., Murray, 302ff.

comparable only with a very early "Homer," an "ante-Pisistratean" phase, when the text was not fixed, when the great poems were hardly distinguished from the mass of the epic cycle, when tradition as well as text was developing and formless. What the chansons teach us in this connection is, that in epochs of epic "fermentation" text is less stable than tradition, which in its turn, as we shall see, is subject to reworking, and that free poetic invention is constantly at work.

Much more important is the evidence supplied by the chansons as to the question of the Homeric dialect.¹⁰ As is well known, the language of the Iliad and Odyssey is by no means homogeneous. The predominant dialect form of the poems is Ionic, but Aeolic words and forms constantly recur, and there is some evidence of an "Attic recension." To account for this mixture, three hypotheses have been proposed: 1, That the epos was composed when Aeolic and Ionic were not differentiated; what we find in Homer is the original "Achaean" dialect, modified somewhat by transmission (Agar, Allen, E. Meyer). 2, That the poems were originally composed in a territory on the boundary of the two dialects and that Homer's language is a sort of "Mischbildung," showing a knowledge of both (Drerup). 3, That the "Aeolisms" of Homer are relics of the dialect in which the poems were composed; that the primitive Homer was an Aeolian and the poems were later transposed into Ionic (Fick, Murray).

Now this mixture of forms belonging to several dialects is a fact familiar to every student of the chansons de geste. Hardly a single version is written in an absolutely "pure" dialect form. No copyist, apparently, hesitated to introduce forms and words of his own dialect into his text, or made any effort to preserve carefully the original orthography and syntax. Of course, this is merely another proof of the fluidity of the text, and as such serves to illustrate what may have happened to Homer in the ages before Pisistratus. Frequently, by careful observation of assonance, rime and measure of verse, it is possible to deduce the dialect of the original version of which we have only the copy. The scribe often writes the rime-word in his own orthography, but rarely takes the trouble to make a new rime. So it is not difficult to restore the dialect of the

¹⁰ See Cauer, 147ff., Drerup, 218ff.

author, and this is frequently done by modern editors. For instance, three very early chansons, *Roland*, the *Pèlerinage de Charlemagne*, and *Gormont et Isembart* are preserved in Anglo-Norman manuscripts, and the orthography is prevailingly Anglo-Norman. But a study of the versification and rimes shows that none of these poems was written in Anglo-Norman, but in a continental dialect which may be restored without much disturbance of the text of the manuscripts.¹¹ In the case of the *Roland* alone are versions preserved in other dialects, one being in the artificial "Franco-Italian" speech-form of which I shall say something later. Of two songs, *Orson de Beauvais* and *Floovant*, we possess only two manuscripts written by Lorraine copyists. The orthography is marked by distinctive Lorraine peculiarities, but a study of the rimes and versification proves that the original poet was not a Lorrainer but a native of another province.

Thus, a mixture of forms belonging to different dialects is common in the manuscripts of most chansons. This mixture is generally due, as I have shown, to the copyists, but in some cases at least is to be ascribed to the author. *Girart de Roussillon*, according to Paul Meyer,¹² was written originally in a dialect lying on the boundary between French and Provençal, and shows a mixture of both languages. Later manuscripts show, in one case, almost pure North-French speech-forms, in another, equally pure Provençal. The *Prise de Cordres*, written by a Champenois, shows many Central-French forms, due undoubtedly to the author. The unique manuscript is the work of a Lorrainer, who has introduced many Lorraine forms.¹³

¹¹ This has been done, e. g., by G. Paris in his "Extraits de la chanson de Roland," and by Bayot in his edition of *Gormont et Isembart*. Since writing the above, I have been able to study the work of Gertrud Wacker, *Ueber das Verhältnis von Dialekt und Schriftsprache im Altfranzösischen* (Beiträge zur Geschichte der romanischen Sprachen und Literaturen, No. 11), Halle, 1916, which deserves the attention of all who discuss the language used by Old French poets. Miss Wacker proves, quite conclusively, that most of these poets wrote in an artificial *coust*—that of the Anglo-Norman and French courts—and deliberately, though not entirely or consistently, suppressed dialectal peculiarities. She does not, however, consider many of the chansons de geste. Her results do not modify essentially the statements made above.

¹² See the Introduction to his translation of the poem, 180ff.

¹³ See Densusianu, Introduction to his edition, 124ff.

Orson de Beauvais was composed probably by a native of the Beauvaisis, but he introduced into his work many "Francien" forms. The manuscript shows an incoherent mixture of three dialects, those of the Ile-de-France, the Beauvaisis, and Lorraine, the last due to the copyist.¹⁴ It is now generally admitted that later poets frequently sought to write in "buen françois," Parisian, though they necessarily retained many traces of their native speech.

The most remarkable instances of dialect-mixture occur in cases where the author or copyist was not a Frenchman, but a Provençal or an Italian. Thus, *Fierabras*, a chanson composed in French and preserved in four manuscripts in that speech, was at an early date transposed into Provençal, and we have of this version one manuscript of the thirteenth century.¹⁵ In its rimes, this manuscript presents a bizarre confusion of Provençal and French forms, due to the incapacity of the translator and his desire to keep the rimes of the original. Again, *Daurel et Beton* is a poem composed undoubtedly by a Provençal minstrel. He has however introduced into his text a large number of French words and forms, due in this case to the fact that at this time French was the accepted epic speech and that most of the poems the author was acquainted with were in that dialect.¹⁶ But where dialect-mixture goes farthest is in the case of the so-called "Franco-Italian" poems. In the twelfth and thirteenth centuries the popularity of the French chansons was so great that the minstrels and poets of North Italy began to give them a dress which should make them more familiar to the ear of their Italian hearers. For this purpose, a curious jargon, half French, half Italian, was devised, which does not correspond to any known speech-form. This wholly artificial poetic language has been called Franco-Italian by modern scholars. In it are preserved versions of several well-known French epics, notably the *Roland*. One chanson, *Macaire*, exists only in this form, but is undoubtedly an adaptation of a French original.¹⁷ Later, in the fourteenth century, original poems, dealing with the same epic legends, were composed in this dialect by native

¹⁴ See G. Paris, *Introd.* pp. VII ff.

¹⁵ See Kroeber et Servois, in the preface to their edition, VI ff.

¹⁶ See P. Meyer, *Introd.* to edition, 36 ff.

¹⁷ See Guessard, *Preface* to his edition, XV ff.

Italians. Such a one is, for example, the *Entrée d'Espagne*,¹⁸ a long and spirited poem intended to serve as an introduction to the *Chanson de Roland*, and composed by a Paduan.

A knowledge of the dialect relations in the chansons de geste would have prevented or modified some rather dogmatic assertions by Homeric scholars. Thus, T. W. Allen, in his recent *Encyclopaedia Britannica* article on Homer,¹⁹ affirms that Fick's theory, according to which originally Aeolic poems were transposed into Ionic, is impossible, because such an event would be "unique in history." But in the history of the French epos such transposition is extremely common, as we have seen. Similarly Agar²⁰ claims that the idea that the epic dialect is an artificial poetic medley, Ionic in the main with some intermixture of other dialects, is "frankly impossible." The idea was not impossible to any Provençal or North Italian poet of the thirteenth or fourteenth century.

This exposition has shown, I think, that the chansons offer no support, by analogy, to the theory that Homer's language represents an original Achæan dialect, out of which Aeolic, Ionic and Attic were developed. But they do present examples of dialect-mixture due to either of the two causes adduced to account for the linguistic conditions of the Homeric poems. In most cases, however, the confusion in them is due to later copyists or adapters, and therefore tends to confirm, by analogy, the justice of the views of Fick and his followers.

A great deal of attention has been given by recent criticism to what may be called "cultural evolution" in the Homeric poems.²¹ As "traditional books" they have been thought to show traces of the development in institutions, manners and beliefs through which the race which produced them passed. A great amount of work of this character has been done, though critics are by no means in accord as to what the results prove. Some think that the poems show an evident mixture of old and new conditions, due partly to "expurgation," partly to retention of traditional features, partly to conscious or unconscious

¹⁸ As to this poem, and the "Franco-Italian" jargon in general, see the exhaustive account of A. Thomas, in the introduction to his edition.

¹⁹ 11th edition, Vol. XIII, p. 632.

²⁰ In his recent work, *Homerica*, Oxford, 1908.

²¹ See especially Murray, 136ff., Causer, 259ff., Lang, *Homer and his Age*, 6ff.

archaizing. Others think that the picture of life presented by Homer is unified and harmonious, though here again with sharp differences of opinion as to the date of the society thus portrayed. The chansons present in this connection some curious analogies to the Iliad and Odyssey, and also considerable indirect evidence as to the possibility of "expurgation" and "archaisms" in the popular epic.

But first a word should be said in regard to the chansons as "traditional books." There is no evidence that the manuscripts of these poems were ever numerous. Most of those preserved belong to one of two classes: small, portable codices, the property of the minstrels who used them to refresh their memory; or, secondly, large, costly volumes, generally cyclic, designed for some nobleman's library.²² There is some evidence to show that the "jongleurs" guarded their manuscripts jealously. But there is no proof that any chanson was ever considered as a holy book, of importance to the race. Notwithstanding their wide popularity, their quasi-historical character (generally credited at the time, as the Pseudo-Turpin,²³ other chronicles and especially the forged monastic charters containing names of epic heroes as witnesses show), the chansons never became official or sacred documents. They were entertainment, not instruction. And as time went on, this popular character increased. The cultivated aristocracy, which during the twelfth and part of the thirteenth centuries had heard the songs gladly, turned away from them. The latest compositions, notwithstanding the efforts of certain court-minstrels like Adenet le Roi²⁴ to give them an aristocratic tone, are bourgeois, not to say vulgar, in style.²⁵ They never became, as the Greek epos did, objects of national reverence and study; there is no Pan-Athenaeon festival in their history.

In such circumstances, it is idle to expect much "expurgation"²⁶ in the chansons. Notwithstanding the numerous revisions they underwent, it is not often that we can say definitely that a certain change is due to a change in the ethical feeling

²² See Gautier, *Epopées*, II, 48ff.

²³ See Bédier, III, 42ff.

²⁴ Author of two rehandled epics, *Berte au grand pied* and *Bueve de Commarchis*.

²⁵ Such are, for example, *Hugues Capet* and *Baudouin de Sebourg*.

²⁶ See Murray, 141ff.

of the poets. But we can see such a process at work in some instances. One of the best-known episodes in the French epos is William of Orange's visit to King Louis in search of aid. The hero arrives at court in sorry state, and is at first mocked and derided. But he succeeds in so impressing Louis that the latter eventually promises assistance. Then Queen Blanche-fleur, William's sister, intervenes against her brother, whereat the latter turns upon her, upbraids her violently, and finally threatens her life. In the earliest version of this story (*Chanson de Guillaume*, 2592-2626) the Queen accuses William of seeking the crown and says that his wife Guiborc, who was "née en païs nisme," designs to poison the King. Thereupon William "a poi n'esraga d'ire," and in a speech whose coarseness of language is unexampled in the French epos, accuses his sister of numberless adulteries and of thinking of naught but her lust and greed. In the second version (*Aliscans*, 2767-2799), Blanchefleur omits all mention of poisoning, and William's speech is softened considerably. In the third version (*Foucon de Candie*, 6688-6768), the Queen, who is not at court, receives the news by letter; then, in a speech of great charm, but based in substance on the preceding versions, she finally recognizes William's merit and consents to Louis' departure. This is evidently a case of expurgation, as Murray uses the term. Another is found in Jehan Bodel's poem *Les Saisnes* (The Saxons). In the two earlier manuscripts is found a narrative relating the disgraceful conduct of the wives of the heroes. These ladies "as qex et as sergentz faisoient lor deliz," while their husbands are warring with the infidel Saxons. The third manuscript omits all the verses (1186-1193, 1639-1773) referring to this episode. But in most cases it is very difficult to determine whether a desire to expurgate or some other motive causes the change. It should also be remembered that there is no background of savagery, of primitive cults and creeds, behind the French legends. Advance in civilisation doubtless occurred in the centuries in which the epos flourished, but that advance found other modes of expression. So that the evidence of the chansons as to expurgation is doubtful.

As to cultural archaisms or archaizing, however, the case is decidedly different. As this is a much debated question in Homeric criticism, I shall discuss it at some length, especially

since the chansons present some curious parallels. Many critics think that indications of two distinct stages in culture can be detected in Homer, an early or "Mycenaean" period agreeing substantially with that disclosed by the archeological discoveries of recent years, and another later stage, agreeing with the ordinary Ionic Greek culture of the sixth century B. C. Some scholars deny these differences altogether; some explain them as the result of a long poetical development which retained some primitive features found in the original "Achaean" lays; still others consider the archaic features the result of conscious archaizing on the part of the Ionic Homer (or Homers).

Now as to archaisms or archaizing in general, it must be said that the evidence of the chansons de geste is directly contrary to anything of the sort. Nothing is more characteristic of the naive medieval poet—whether minstrel or clerk matters not—than his total incapacity to imagine a society or a civilisation different from his own. This trait is most marked, of course, in those poems which borrow their "matter" from antiquity. In the *Roman de Troie*,²⁷ for example (based on Dictys and Dares), or the *Roman de Thèbes*²⁸ (based on Statius' *Thebais*), the heroes, named in this case Hector, Achilles, Adrastus or Tydeus, fight on horseback with lances and are armed with hauberk, helm and oblong shield, exactly like Roland or the contemporary knights of the crusading epoch. In the case of the chansons de geste, every attempt to show the existence in them of cultural archaisms has been vain. All the traits of the life described in them, political, social, religious, agree with those of the feudal society of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, and with nothing else. They do not ever agree, save in representing Charlemagne as "emperor" and a mighty ruler, with those of the Frankish, pre-feudal society of the age of Charles the Great and Louis I. And when changes in culture occur, the poet puts these changes, when they concern his "matter," naively into his picture of the heroic age. A striking but crude illustration of this tendency is the reference to "cordeliers et jacobins" (Franciscan and Dominican friars) put into the

²⁷ About 1160, by Benoit de Sainte Maure, pub. by Constans, 6 vols. Paris, 1904-12.

²⁸ Early twelfth century, anonymous, published by Constans, 2 vols. Paris, 1890.

mouth of a baron of Charlemagne in *Gaydon*,²⁹ a chanson of the early thirteenth century. Neither order was established in France till after 1200. The chansons do not, of course, present a complete and accurate picture of feudal society as a whole. Many traits are neglected or distorted, this being especially noticeable in the treatment of church matters. Now let us consider some special cases where the parallel between medieval France and Homeric Greece is well marked.

First, as to writing. It is well known that Homer makes only one doubtful allusion to that art.³⁰ Earlier critics believed that this showed that the Greeks were ignorant of the art of writing till after the composition of the poems, so that the latter must once have existed as a purely oral production. The recent discoveries in Crete have refuted this assumption; there is now no doubt that writing was known to the Aegean peoples at a date long anterior to that usually given of the Trojan War. How then account for Homer's apparent ignorance of it? E. Meyer and Wilamowitz regard this ignorance as a deliberate archaism. The poet or poets suppressed all reference to writing and letters. Here the example of the chansons may teach us caution. Notwithstanding the knowledge of writing, books and letters prevalent in feudal France (a knowledge far more widely spread than is generally supposed), the references to writing in the chansons are singularly scanty. Generally, it is mentioned only when the king or baron summons his men to join him, when he sends out "ses bries et ses chartres." Thus in *Aymeri de Narbonne* (4708 lines) writing (or, the same thing for our purpose, books and reading) is mentioned only three times, in *Raoul de Cambrai* (8726 lines) four times. These references in *Raoul* are interesting: two, lines 1305 and 1506, are allusions to a book, a "sautier," owned by a nun; one, line 1795, is a boast by one of the heroes that his enemy's death is "escrite el grant fer de ma lance," written on his lance's point; the other, line 5538, is one of the usual kind, the king ordering his "escrivains" (variant, "chapelains"), to "faire mes chartres." In the late and unoriginal *Gui de Bourgogne* the only allusion to the art is the statement (line 1666) by Archbishop Turpin

²⁹ *Gaydon*, 6456: *Et cordeliers et jacobins bates.*

³⁰ In Z, 168-169. See Caer, 260ff., Drerup, 70ff.

that he is "bons clers letrez," a good clerk knowing his letters. I wonder if the epithets applied to Kalchas (N 70) *θεοπρόνος οἰωνοτῆς* do not imply just as much,—or as little. In *Parise la Duchesse* (3107 lines, late) the only allusion is the statement (line 965) that the young son of the heroine Parise "aprist a letres tant qu'il en sot assez." Lastly it might be mentioned that in the very early first part of the *Chanson de Guillaume* (1983 lines) there is not one allusion to books, reading or writing. All this proves of course that books and writing did not much interest the poets of the chansons, nor their public. Might not the same be said of Homer?

Another much disputed question in the cultural relations of Homer is that of armor.²¹ Some scholars contend that there is clear evidence that two sorts of armor can be distinguished, used by the heroes of the Homeric poems, an earlier "Mycenaean" kind consisting of a helmet and huge, figure-8 shield, but no body-armor; the other, that of the later Greeks of the classical age, helm, round shield, greaves, corselet. Many critics claim that the lines referring to round shields, greaves and corselets are inorganic, interpolated by the redactors. Now the medieval system of defensive armor likewise underwent changes,²² which are reflected in the epic poems, but *not* in the same poem. Originally, the feudal knight was protected by a helm, a plain, oblong shield and a byrny (broigne). The latter was a long leather tunic on which rings of iron were sewed. In the eleventh century the "broigne" was gradually supplanted by the "haubert" or mail-shirt. The shield became broader and was painted with a "blazon" or coat of arms. Later, in the early fourteenth century, plate armor began to replace mail. Now the earlier chansons use the words "broigne" and "haubert" as synonymous, but before the end of the twelfth century the poets give up entirely the use of the former term. In the earlier chansons also, the shields are "peinz à flors," but there is no mention of armorial bearings. The earliest mention of the latter is in the *Prise d'Orange*, a chanson which dates from

²¹ See Murray, 173 ff., Caer, 270 ff., Reichel, *Homerische Waffen*, 2d ed. Vienna, 1901.

²² See especially L. Gautier, *La Chevalerie*, 705 ff., Enlart, *Manuel d'archéologie française*, III, 451 ff.

about 1160, just the time when the first blazoned shields appear on funeral effigies, etc. The coincidence is striking, though I fear it will bring no comfort to those who believe in an archaizing epic. Still more noteworthy is the fact that in the few late chansons which date from the fourteenth century the heroes begin to wear plate armor, as in *Baudouin de Sebours* (vol. II, p. 350): "apres le jaserant qu'a maint estour porta, unes plates d'achier par desseure lacha."³³ Everywhere then in the Old French epic we find the poet dressing his heroes in the armor of his own day. Nowhere does any "Carolingian" armor occur, though naturally Saracens and heathen sometimes wear outlandish devices, and there is one attempt (*Otinel*, 300ff.) to describe a huge, elaborate shield, possibly a reminiscence of the shield of Aeneas.³⁴

Professor Gilbert Murray, in his discussion of this question, cites two identical passages in the *Iliad* as proving the "inorganic" character of the verses referring to the corselet. These are the lines:³⁵

διὰ μὲν ἀσπίδος ἦλθε φαεινῆς ὄβριμον ἔγχος,
καὶ διὰ θώρηκος πολυδαίδαλου ἡρήρειστο·
ἀντικρὺ δὲ παρὰ λαπάρην διάμυσσε χιτῶνα
ἔγχος· ὁ δ' ἐκλίνθη καὶ ἀλέατο κῆρα μέλαιναν.

which he translates as follows:

"Right through the shining shield the strong spear came
(And drove heavily through the richly-wrought corselet)
And straight on beside his flank it cut through his tunic.
That spear did: but he twisted aside and escaped black death."

Murray says apropos of this:³⁶ "Without the bracketed line the sense is clear. But with it? Does not every reader feel some difference. You can twist aside from a spear that is coming through your shield, but not from one that has driven heavily through your breastplate." Ergo, to him, the "thorex-line"

³³ "After the coat of mail which he had worn in many a battle, he laced on some plates of steel over it."

³⁴ As to Virgilian and other classical reminiscences in the chansons, see Wilmotte, *Le Français à la tête épique*, 99ff.

³⁵ Γ, 358ff.; H, 252ff.

³⁶ See Murray, 177.

is an interpolation, as all "thorex-lines" are. Now as it happens we have an almost exact parallel to this passage, in a well-known scene of the Old French epos, the fight between William and the giant Saracen Corsolt in the *Couronnement de Louis* (lines 966-973):

Un dart molu a pris a son arçon,
Envers Guillelme le lança de randon,
Si bruit li cols come uns alerions.
Li cuens guenchi, qui dota le felon,
Porquant li trenche son escu a lion;
La vieille broigne ne li fist guarison,
Lez le costé li passe a tel randon
Que d'altre part fiert dous piez el sablon.

which may be translated:

He (Corsolt) took a sharp dart from his saddle-bow;
Toward William he hurled it violently,
The cast shrilled like an eagle.
The Count, who feared the knave, twisted aside,
Natheless it cut through his lion-painted shield,
His old byrny saved him not,
Close to his flank it passed so violently
That on the other side it stuck two feet in the sand.

Here we find almost the same sequence of events as in Homer, save that the "twisting aside" is placed, more logically, before the piercing of the shield. The spear cuts through the shield and then the corselet, grazing the side of the hero; but he, like Alexander, "twisted aside and escaped black death." No one could possibly claim, however, that the byrny-line is here a late interpolation. Personally, I cannot feel any difficulty in either case. A similar passage occurs in *Jourdain de Blaye*, 1912-1918:

Brandist la hanste au fer tranchant molu
Et fiert Jordain au vermoil de l'escu,
Desoz la boucle li a fraint et fendu,
Le bon hauberc desmaillie et rompu.
Lez le costel li passe le fer nu,
Dex le garist, qu'en char ne l'a feru.

"He brandished the lance-shaft with sharp cutting point and smote Jourdain on the red of his shield; under the boss he shattered and split it, rent and broke the good hauberk. Close to his flank he drives the bare iron. But God protected him, so

that he did not wound his flesh." Here no "twisting aside" is mentioned; the spear passes through shield and corselet, but God saves the hero. This seems to me more awkward than anything in Homer; but the awkwardness cannot be removed by excising the hauberk-line. Why should similar lines be considered interpolations in the *Iliad*?

Marriage settlements form another criterion for distinguishing early and late "strata" in Homer, according to some critics.³⁷ They allege that in primitive Greece men bought their wives for a price, while in the classical age the father gave a dowry with his daughter when she married. Most of the heroes seem to follow the older custom, paying bride-gifts for their wives; but there are some cases where a dowry provided by the bride's father is mentioned. A similar difference in marriage customs prevailed in medieval France, and is reflected in the epos; but the difference there was local, not temporal.³⁸ Some provinces, especially in the South, clung to the Roman "dos" system; others had adopted the Teutonic custom by which the husband dowered the wife. This gift was called the "douaire" or the "oscle." Most of the poems mention the latter custom. For example, Aymeri de Narbonne, when he took to wife Hermengarde, the Lombard king's daughter, is asked by his uncle to name her dowry. He answers:

Dist Aymeris: "Bien en ert asenée:
Premierement soit Nerbone nommée,
Et Biaulandois et Biaulande la lée,
Car en doaire fu ma mere donée.
Or resoît hui Hermenjart delivrée."³⁹

"Said Aymeri: 'Well will she be dowered: First let Narbonne be named, and Beaulandais and Beaulande the wide, for that was given as dowry to my mother. Now let it be granted to Hermengarde.'" Here we see the bride receiving as her "douaire" the husband's mother's dowry, and in addition a city conquered by the latter. On the other hand, when King Louis

³⁷ Murray, 185ff., Cauer, 286ff.

³⁸ See Gautier, *La Chevalerie*, 357ff., Viollet, *Histoire du droit civil français*, 826ff., 849ff.

³⁹ *Aymeri de Narbonne*, 4438ff.

gives his sister in marriage to Elie of Saint-Gilles, in the chanson of that name, he bestows on her as her "dot":

Asses castieus et fermetés
Orliens et Behorges qu'est dame des chités.*

"castles and strongholds in abundance, Orléans, and Bourges, the queen of cities." So likewise in *Amis et Amiles*, when Charlemagne gives his daughter Belissant to Amiles, he says to her:

Belissans bele, dex vos a fait aiue,
Servez Amile com sa fame et sa drue.
Riviers li doins, s'il devant moi voz jure,
Ma grant cité desor l'eve de Dunne.⁴

"Fair Belissant, God hath helped you, serve Amile as his wife and his love. I give him Riviers, if he pledge you before me, my great city on the Dunne water." These customs are of course not quite the same as those of Homeric Greece. The "douaire" was not given to the bride's family, but to the bride herself, and remained hers in case of her husband's death. But the co-existence, both in history and epos, of these two customs should be sufficient to raise a doubt as to whether *ἔδνα* in Homer constitute a really archaic trait.

These analogies might be pursued further, but enough has been adduced, I think, to show how necessary it is to be cautious in discussing such data. A scholar intimately acquainted with the chansons, or with other medieval poetry, would find it very difficult to accept the possibility of cultural archaisms or archaizing in a "popular" epic; and by "popular" I mean one destined to appeal by public recitation to the people as a whole. In fact, far from retaining or introducing archaic traits, the chansons are remarkable for the tendency to introduce neologisms in customs or institutions. Each new poet, each "remanieur," never hesitates to mention a characteristic of his own time and to ascribe it boldly to the age of Charlemagne. I have already mentioned religious orders as one example of this. Another is the mention, frequent in the chansons after about 1150, of "bourgeois" and "communes." These, the

* *Elie de Saint Gilles*, 2205ff.

⁴ *Amis et Amiles*, 1756ff.

chartered free towns and their self-governing citizens, were first recognized as a definite social organization in Northern France in the first half of the twelfth century.⁴² We find allusions to them in a number of chansons, notably in the early and popular *Chevalerie Ogier* (3816-18):

Li borgois ont la grant cloque sonée
E la petite tot d'une randonée
E la comugne est tantost asanlée.

"The burgesses have rung the big bell and the little one, all in one peal, and the commune is assembled straightway." In *Orson de Beauvais* the burgesses of Beauvais play a considerable part. In regard to this, Gaston Paris says:⁴³ "Il y a certainement là un souvenir des interventions fréquentes du roi, au XII siècle, dans les démêlés des seigneurs avec les communes." In some of the later chansons the "bourgeois" are glorified at the expense of the nobles.

Another striking analogy in custom, though it does not contribute essentially to the "problem," is presented by the position taken by the minstrel,⁴⁴ the *doïdés*, and by the allusions to songs and singing. One instance is found in the French epos of a hero, like Achilles in I, "taking his pleasure of a loud lyre . . . delighting his soul and singing the glories of heroes." This is found in *Renaut de Montauban*, 6459ff. Renaut and his three brothers are riding, unarmed, to meet the Emperor, who intends to seize them treacherously.

Aalars et Guichars commencerent un son,
Gasconoï fu li dis et limosins li ton
Et Richars lor bordone belement par desos.
Ainc rote ne viele ne nul psalterion
Ne vos pleüst si bien come li troi baron.

"Aalart and Guichart began a song, Gascon were the words, Limousin the melody, and Richard sings fairly the bass. Never rote, nor viol nor any psaltery would have delighted you so much

⁴² See especially A. Luchaire, *Les communes françaises à l'époque des Capétiens directs*, Paris, 1890.

⁴³ Introduction, p. LX.

⁴⁴ As to the "jongleurs" in general, see especially Faral, *Les Jongleurs en France au moyen âge*, Paris, 1910.

as the three barons." But Renaut is troubled and anxious, whereat Aalart says to him:

Ahi, Renaus, car chantes, ja as tu si bel ton;
Mult est longue la voie, si nos oblierom.

"Ah, Renaut, prithee sing, thou hast so fair a voice; long is the way, it will give us forgetfulness." We also find, in a "roman d'aventure," the *Roman de la Violette*, 1400-1405,⁴⁸ the hero Gerard, count of Nevers, disguised as a "jongleur," singing a stave of the chanson *Aliscans*:

Grans fu la cours en la sale a Loon.

But often the hero has a minstrel in his service, who occupies a position like that of Phemius or Demodocus in the *Odyssey*. Thus, William of Orange, in the *Chanson de Guillaume*, 1259ff., has a "jugleur":

En tote France n'at si bon chanteür
Ne en bataille plus hardi fereür.
Il li set dire de geste les changuns:
De Clodoveu le premier roi Francur,
Ki creeit primes en Deu nostre seignur,
E de sun fiz Flovent le poigneür,
De dulce France qui il laissat l'onur,
De tuz les reis ki furent de valur
Tresqu'a Pepin, le petit poigneür,
De Charle Maigne, de Rollant sun nevou,
E de Girart, e d'Olivier le prou.

"In all France there is none so good a singer, nor a bolder smiter in battle. He knoweth how to tell over the songs of geste: of Clovis the first king of the Franks to believe on God our Lord, and of his son, Floovant the warrior, to whom he left the honor of sweet France, of all the kings of worth, down to Pippin, the short warrior, of Charles the Great, of Roland his nephew, and of Girart and of Oliver the valiant." In moments of depression, the minstrel sings to the heroes, just as Phemius does. So in *Hucn de Bordeaux*, 8438ff.:

Le menestrel apela Huelins:
"Pren te viele, por Diu, biaux dos amis;

⁴⁸ This passage is reprinted in Bartsch et Horning, *La langue et la littérature françaises*, 394.

Après tous deus se convient resjoïr;
 Resbaudis nos, par amor je t'en pri." . . .
 Li menestreus ne se vot arester;
 Erraument a sa viele atempré,
 A trente cordes fait se harpe soner,
 Et li palais en tentist de tous les.

"Huon bade forth the minstrel: 'Take thy viol, fair sweet friend, for God's sake; after all woe it is meet to rejoice; delight us now, I pray thee, by thy love.' . . . The minstrel tarried not; straightway he tuned his viol and made the harp of thirty strings to twang, and the palace resounded round about."

But the most curious resemblance to Homeric usage in this connection occurs in the *Moniage Guillaume I*, 439ff.: William of Orange, who has retired to a monastery, is riding alone with a "vallet," who is also apparently a minstrel. He bids him sing.

Li vallés l'ot, prist soi a escrier,
 Bien hautement commencha a chanter:
 "Volés sir de dant Tibaut l'Escler,
 Et de Guillaume, le marcis au cort nés,
 Si com il prist Orenge la chité,
 Et prist Orable a moillier et a per,
 Et Gloriete, le palais principer?

"The varlet heard him, began to shout and sing: 'Will ye hear about lord Tybalt the heathen, and about William, the short-nosed lord, how he took Orange the city, and took Orable for wife and peer, and Gloriete the lordly palace?'" Does not this remind one of Demodocus in the *Odyssey*, singing, at Odysseus' behest, a song of his deeds at Troy? I believe that in both cases the poet has ascribed the customs of his own day to the men of the heroic age. The position and actions of the minstrels, as they appear in the chansons, are in all respects true to the conditions of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, whereas we have no positive evidence that they existed in the age of Charlemagne.

I turn now to the question of the historical character of the persons and events that appear in the epos. Here, as is well known, opinions of Homeric scholars diverge widely. Some believe that most of the heroes are of mythical origin, earlier tribal gods becoming men. Others affirm the essentially his-

torical character of the personages of the epos.⁴⁶ Students of the Old French epos are in this respect more fortunate than those of Homer. The historical records of the heroic age of France—covering roughly the reigns of Pippin, Charlemagne and Louis I—are numerous enough to enable us to test, to a certain degree, the accuracy of the legends. Here surprises await the incautious. The chansons have a specious air of true history, and purport of themselves to be such. The chanson form was indeed used in some cases for the writing of chronicles, either contemporaneous (*Chanson de la Croisade contre les Albigeois*, Garnier's *Vie de saint Thomas le Martyr*, Jordan Fantosme), or posterior and mixed with legendary elements (*Antioch, Jérusalem*, Cuvelier's *Chronique de Bertrand du Guesclin*). Moreover, the legends recounted in the chansons were generally regarded, in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, as veracious history. The clerical chroniclers frequently give them a Latin form, or incorporate them in their records.⁴⁷ In the forged charters of the monasteries the names of the epic heroes appear as witnesses.⁴⁸ But appearances are deceptive. The stories told in the poems are mostly fiction, due, it seems, to the free creative imagination of the "jongleurs" working on a few names and events supplied by local tradition or by the clergy. Let us see now about how much "Wahrheit" there may be in the "Dichtung" of the French epic poets.

Out of the thousands of characters in the different chansons, M. Bédier has shown that fifty-five only can be positively identified with real persons of the heroic age.⁴⁹ But a majority of these are unimportant, playing a minor rôle in the legends. Of the chief heroes some twenty are historic; that is, they bear historic names. But how little does the epos know of the real career of the men it celebrates! What, for example, does it know of Pippin, save that he was father of Charlemagne and husband of a Bertha? What does it know of Roland, save that he was killed at Roncesvaux? Of William, save that he had a wife called Guibourc, fought with the Saracens and died in a monas-

⁴⁶ Especially W. Leaf; the chief upholders of the mythical theory are Bethe and Thomson.

⁴⁷ See Bédier, IV, 419-20.

⁴⁸ See Bédier, IV, 421-24.

⁴⁹ See Bédier, IV, 347ff.

tery? Of Louis the Pious, save that he was crowned at Aix during his father's lifetime? Of Girard "of Roussillon," save that he fought against a king named Charles and was a patron of the monasteries of Vézelay and Pothières? Charlemagne is naturally better known, but it would be totally impossible to reconstruct, from the data in the epos, a biography even remotely resembling that of Charles the Great. His character is not consistently drawn, and his deeds are mostly imaginary.

Let us take one of the minor figures. A personage who appears in many poems is Richard "li Vieuz" of Normandy,⁴⁰ without doubt identical with Richard I (†996). All that the poets know of him is that he was duke of Normandy and that he built the abbey of Fécamp. But they make him a contemporary of Charlemagne and give him a rôle not only inconsistent with history but with their own data. Thus, in the *Couronnement de Louis* ⁴¹ Richard dies in prison at Orléans under Louis I; in the *Roland* ⁴² he is killed, years before, in Spain by the Emir Baligant; in the *Chevalerie Ogier* ⁴³ he is slain, still earlier, by King Désier in Italy; which does not prevent the author of *Gormont et Isembart* ⁴⁴ from having him killed by Gormont at Cayeux. Suppose that we had no information about Richard of Normandy save what the chansons tell us, could we reconstruct his biography? Could we even tell when he lived? Yet his case seems to me quite the same as that of Glaucus or Idomeneus or Aias the Lesser, or other secondary figures in the Greek epos. For all the poets knew, Richard was just as real or as unreal as Naimes of Bavaria or Oliver or Bertrand "li Palazins" or numberless other secondary personages who have never lived outside the epos. If the records had disappeared, we simply could not tell which heroes are "historic," which are purely imaginary.

It should be noted that in no case in France do we find mythological figures becoming heroes. A few such figures are introduced into the chansons, such as Auberon the king of

⁴⁰ See Bédier, IV, 3-18.

⁴¹ *Couronnement de Louis*, 2218-21.

⁴² *Chanson de Roland*, 3470ff.

⁴³ *Chevalerie Ogier*, 5409ff.

⁴⁴ *Gormont et Isembart*, 140ff.

"faery" in *Huon de Bordeaux*, Malabron the "lutin" in *Gaufray*, Wayland the Smith, as well as Gabriel, Michael and other Christian divinities. But they are always carefully distinguished from the heroes, who have nothing in common with them. Sometimes, as we shall see, the heroes become saints after death; but saints and divinities never become heroes. To a student of the French epos, the theories of Bethe, Thomson⁵⁵ and others, making Agamemnon and Achilles tribal gods and Penelope a divine waterfowl, seem unconvincing.

In fact, none of the warriors sung in the chansons is a tribal hero. At the time the "jongleurs" wrote, all tribal consciousness had been lost in the unity of Christian Europe. National consciousness—the pride of "la douce France" and the French name—does exist. It is asserted especially against the Saracen, the common enemy, as also against "Thiois et Lombartz," who are more or less despised. Another sort of race feeling, which we might expect to show itself—provincial patriotism⁵⁶—hardly appears either. The French provinces were all constituted under their local dynasties at the time of epic production, but there is little provincial feeling apparent in the chansons. A favorite theme is the revolt of a great noble against the King, but this noble, Girart, Renaut, Ogier or another, is not represented as the embodiment of local or provincial patriotism. Moreover, "Sagenverschiebung," if we care to call it that, does occur, but is not, as far as we can see, due to tribal migration. Thus William "of Orange," historically a Frank of the North and a cousin of Charlemagne, is always represented as a member of the family of Narbonne. This is hardly significant. The heroes, Roland, Girart, Ogier, William, are consistently represented as feudal lords, rulers over many vassals, all subject to one overlord Charlemagne, and all engaged in a struggle against an Eastern foe, the Saracens. Conditions may have been different in Greece, where tribal feeling was undoubtedly stronger than in feudal France. But after all, are not Achilles, Odysseus, Aias, Diomedes, likewise feudal lords, rulers over many vassals, all subject to one overlord, Agamemnon, and all engaged in a struggle against an Eastern foe?

⁵⁵ See especially Thomson, *Studies in the Odyssey*, chaps. 1, 2, 3.

⁵⁶ One apparent exception is *Gaydon*, which celebrates the Angevins and the dukes of Anjou.

Another interesting comparison with the Greek epos is supplied by the discovery of M. Bédier that in most cases the heroes and their exploits, so far as they are historical at all, are localized, and that this localization is connected with a church, a shrine or a pilgrimage route.⁵⁷ There existed formerly at least twenty-eight churches containing thirty-six tombs or shrines of persons who were important figures in the chansons. Twenty other churches could be named which preserved or helped to propagate legends about these heroes. And these churches or shrines were among the most important in Christian Europe, frequented by throngs of pious pilgrims. They included such well-known places of devotion as Saint James of Compostella, Saint Denis of France, Saint Peter's of Cologne, or such great abbeys as Gellone, Saint-Riquier, Fécamp, Stavelot and Vézelay. In many cases, the heroes were regarded as founders or patrons; their relics were venerated; in two instances at least they became saints and were worshipped as such. Nor did popular piety make any distinction between real and imaginary heroes. In the church of St. Romain at Blaye was shown the tomb of Roland (possibly authentic), as well as the tombs of Oliver and Fair Alda (who certainly never existed). In the abbey of Gellone (Hérault) was the shrine of Saint William, central figure of a whole cycle of legends and a historical figure. At Cologne and Dortmund were shrines of "Saint" Renaut, likewise the central figure of a cycle of legends, but by no means historical. The analogy between these shrines of sainted heroes in medieval Europe and the shrines of "divine" heroes in ancient Greece is certainly striking.

One of the most remarkable instances of this process is that of the shrine of Ogier in the abbey of Saint Faro at Meaux.⁵⁸ The monks of Saint Faro, in the tenth century, venerated as one of their founders a certain Othgerius, about whom they composed a short legend, the *Conversio Othgerii militis*. In this they represent Othgerius as an illustrious warrior who retired to their convent, persuaded Charlemagne to make them some valuable gifts, and died there "in the odor of sanctity." It cannot be proved that this Othgerius is historical, or that he

⁵⁷ See Bédier, IV, 403ff.

⁵⁸ See Bédier, II, 288ff.

had at first any connection with "Ogier li Danois," the epic hero. But when the latter had become celebrated, in the twelfth century, the identification was made; and about 1170 the monks of Saint Faro erected in honor of their hero a splendid chapel and monument, with mortuary statues of Ogier and his squire, and around them, under the vault of the chapel, six other figures from the chansons, Oliver, Roland, Alda, Turpin and others. Greek scholars have pointed out the possibility of ἡρώα of Agamemnon, Achilles or Helen replacing earlier shrines of autochthonic gods or goddesses. Is not the case of Ogier at Meaux a similar phenomenon?

Another point to be noticed in this connection is the relation that the epics themselves bear to the shrines, pilgrimages and festivals. M. Bédier has proved that the majority of the older and better chansons were probably composed for the delectation and instruction of the throngs of pilgrims who frequented the sanctuaries and the routes that led to them. Notably the *Chanson de Roland*⁸⁹ is localized on the "camino francés," the road to Compostella; and relics of the hero were shown in the churches along this route. In Bordeaux, for instance, an important station on the way, the ivory horn "olifant," given by Charlemagne after Roland's death to the church of Saint Seurin, was shown to the pilgrims, as is mentioned in the *Chanson*, 3684ff.:

Vint a Burdeles, la citet de valor,
Desur l'alter Saint Seurin le barun
Met l'oliphan plein d'or et de manguns;
Li pelerin le veient qui la vunt.

"He (Charlemagne) came to Bordeaux, the city of worth; on the altar of the noble Saint Seurin he placed the olifant, full of gold and coin; the pilgrims who go that way still see it."

Moreover, it is certain that at least two chansons, the *Pèlerinage de Charlemagne* and *Fierabras*,⁹⁰ were composed for the festival called the "Lendit," held at Saint-Denis in June every year. This festival was instituted in 1109. Do not these facts recall what little we know as to the early history of the Homeric poems? They also celebrated heroes closely associated with

⁸⁹ See Bédier, III, 291ff.

⁹⁰ See Bédier, IV, 121ff.

old shrines; they also were sung at public festivals, the Panionia and the Panathenaia, which attracted great crowds of worshippers. Who knows but that at some period there may not have existed that sort of collaboration between priest and "aoidos" which certainly prevailed between "clerc" and "jongleur," and to which most of the "historical elements" in the French epos are due. Of course, all this is analogical conjecture, without evidential value.

In one or two particular instances of historic usage, other analogies could be adduced. I shall choose only one, the geographical name *Argos*.⁶¹ Homer employs this word in at least four different meanings. It denotes: 1, simply the city; 2, the whole Argolic plain, especially as the home of Agamemnon; 3, Southern Greece, the Peloponnesus; 4, Greece as a whole, both north and south. I leave to Greek scholars the explanation of this, but call attention to the fact that in the chansons the name *France* is used likewise with a threefold meaning, due to historic causes. It denotes—⁶²

1. All of Charlemagne's empire, in the widest sense, including German towns like Cologne and Aix-la-Chapelle; for example, *Moniage Guillaume II*, 4234:

France prendrons jusc'as pors de Coloigne.

Chanson de Roland, 36:

En France ad Ais s'en deit bien repairier.

2. It means the later "regnum francorum" of the Capetian kings; for example, *Girart de Roussillon*, §320: "C'est d'une fière bataille que je vous parle, dont France et Allemagne furent dépeuplées."

Huon de Bordeaux, 2362:

Mais ne retourt en France le regné.

3. It is used, more rarely, to connote the Ile-de-France, the scanty "royal domain" of the same Capetian kings. For ex-

⁶¹ See Leaf, *Homer and History*, 193ff.

⁶² See especially Hoefft, *France, Franceis und Frano im Rolandslied*, Strassburg, 1891.

ample, *Raoul de Cambrai*, 6150, Guerri, speaking at Arras, says:

Alons en France a bataille rengie.

Les Narbonnais, 1847ff., the sons of Aymeri are riding from the south:

Par mi Berri a force et a bandon
Vont chevauchant a coite d'esperon;
A Orlens vindrent, si passerent le pont,
Lors entrerent en France.

"Through Berri swiftly and strongly they go spurring as they ride; they came to Orléans and passed the bridge, then they entered France." To the poets of the twelfth century the connotations 2 and 3 were familiar, in daily use among their contemporaries; the broad meaning 1 was a matter of historical knowledge, more or less vague, of Charlemagne's empire.

In addition to the comparisons already mentioned, the chansons also contain considerable material for investigation of the methods and processes used in a period of epic production, and enable us to test, in some cases, the validity of internal evidence in questions of composition.⁶⁸ Owing to the general instability of their text and to the fact that no poet, scribe or minstrel ever felt obliged to reproduce his original without variation, we find sometimes several different poetic versions of the same epic legend. Early poems are often revised, interpolated, extended, abridged, or altogether rewritten. The most frequent cause of alterations of this nature was a change in metrical form. The early poems were written, for the most part, in ten- or twelve-syllabled verses, united into stanzas or "laisses" of varying length by assonance. A later fashion demanded full rime in place of assonance, and many poems were revised to introduce it. Other causes for change were involved in the desire to fit the poem into a cycle, or to please a new audience, or simply to tell the story in a different way. Expansion is more common than abridgement; and interpolation "in mediis rebus" is less usual than extension or revision at the beginning or the end of the poem. I intend now to cite some examples of these various alterations, taking care to choose such cases as present some

⁶⁸ See Caer, 371ff.

analogy to those cited by Homeric critics as possibly occurring in the *Iliad* or the *Odyssey*.

First of all, the general tendency of the "remanieurs" is to make two verses grow where only one grew before. This is especially the case when assonance is turned into rime, but it also occurs where both versions had the same verse structure.²⁴ For example, our oldest version of the *Chanson de Roland*, contained in the Oxford manuscript *Digby 23*, is written in assonant ten-syllabled lines. Later rehandled texts introduce full rime, often by expanding a single verse to two or more. This is the way it is done:

Oxford, 3679	Muntet li reis e si hume trestuit
MS of Versailles	Monte li rois, o lui ses vavasors
	Ogiers et Naimés et Jofroiz l'amoros.
Oxford, 157	Bels fu li vespres e li soleilz fut clers
Versailles	Biaus fu li jors, si prist a decliner
	Et li solaus si prist a esconser.

But in many cases this expansion is not dictated by the necessity of finding a rime. For example, take the passage *Huon de Bordeaux*, 2931ff.:

Tant ont ensanle le droit cemin erré
K'en un boschage ont un homme trové,
La barbe ot longue desqu'au neu del baudré.

"So far have they together wandered along the straight way that in a wood they have found a man, who had a long beard reaching to the knot of his baldrick." Here MS b adds, uselessly:

Qui fu si fais com vous dire m'orrés:
Viez fu et fraile, si ot cent ans pasés.

"Who was formed as you will hear me tell: Old he was and frail, had passed his hundredth year."

So in the *Chevalerie Vivien*, 696:

Dist Vivien: "Ensin en est alei.
A nos parens fust toz jorz reprové.

²⁴ See especially Gautier, *Epopées*, I, 420ff.

"Said Vivien: 'Thus hath it gone. (Otherwise) it would have been always a matter of shame to our kindred.'" MSS A and B add the synonymous line:

Tenu nos fust toz jorz mes a vilté.

"Always it would have been imputed unto us as cowardice." Ibid. 1096, Gerard comes to William and says:

En non Deu, sire, vos ne me ravisés?
Je suis vos nies, Gerars suis apellés.

To which MSS AB add the following line with genealogical information, of interest to us, but no news to William:

Filz sui Buevon et de Commarchis nez.

Is it not entirely possible that many "inorganic" lines in the Homeric poems, especially such as were rejected by the Alexandrian critics, may be due to the same process of expansion by copyists, such as, for example, A 139, B 528, N 256, N 350, λ 52-54, and many others.

Sometimes however the copyist abridged instead of expanding, even to a point hurtful to the sense. For example, in *Gaydon*, 4512ff. The youth Savari escapes from his wicked father and rows across a stream:

Tant a nagié li enfes son travel
Qu'arrivez est desoz un arbrissel.

"So far hath the youth rowed his bark that he hath arrived beneath a sapling." Then the next *laisse* begins immediately:

Savaris monte par desor Ataignant

"Savari mounts on Ataignant," without our being told who Ataignant is or where he was found. MS b adds, before the second *laisse*:

Vint a l'estable la ou sont li poutrel,
Sor Ataignant le bon cheval isnel
A mjs la sele et le fraig a noel,
Puis est montés par l'estrier a noel.

"He came to the stable where the colts are; on Ataignant the good swift horse he put the saddle and graven bridle, and then mounted by the carved stirrup." These verses are necessary to

the sense and were evidently in the original, but MS a has dropped them. In the *Couronnement de Louis*, 590ff., all the manuscripts save one read (the Pope is addressing William of Orange):

"Ahi," dit il, "nobles chevaliers,
Cil te guarisse qui en croiz fu dreciez!
Tel hardement ne dist mais chevaliers.
Ou que tu ailles, Jesus te puisse aidier!"

"Ah," said he, "noble knight, may He save you who was raised on the cross! Never did knight utter such a bold saying. Wherever you go, may Jesus aid you!"

The MS C omits the second and third lines of this passage. They are not indispensable, but the text certainly runs more smoothly with them. It would of course require a very skilled analyst to determine where similar contractions or omissions have occurred in the text of Homer.

These are matters however which concern textual criticism rather than the problem of composition. But the alterations in the chansons often go much farther. A number of lines may be put into one *laisse*, or one or more *laises* may be interpolated. As a rule, such interpolations do not contribute much to the action. Some are typical of the minstrel profession. So, for example, in *Aliscans*, after line 4579 two manuscripts insert a passage of 44 lines, in which the "jongleur" interrupts the narrative to make an appeal to the generosity of his hearers.⁵⁵ This may be compared, roughly, to the so-called "Rhapsoden-zusaetze"⁵⁶ in Homer, as in II 102-112, Y 495-504. In *Gui de Bourgogne*, 191ff., a passage of 37 verses in one *laisse* is expanded in one manuscript into 166 verses divided among four *laises*. This interpolation contains a catalogue of the young heroes of the story, and so resembles, on a small scale, the catalogues in Homer.

A favorite stylistic device of the French poets, as well as the Homeric rhapsodes, was repetition or parallelism. Of course, in most cases, this was due to the original composer of the epic, and is no proof of late or composite authorship. But in some

⁵⁵ A device employed in the original version of *Huon de Bordeaux*, 4958ff., *Gui de Bourgogne*, 4135ff., and elsewhere.

⁵⁶ See Wilamowitz, *Die Ilias und Homer*, 87, 94ff., etc.

cases, as the codices show, the "remanieurs" insert passages of varying length repeating with some change of wording what had gone before. A good example of this, on a small scale, is found in *Huon de Bordeaux*, 416ff. The two sons of the Duchess of Bordeaux have been summoned to court by messengers and are about to set out. Their mother gives them much good advice at parting, especially urging them to be generous toward the envoys of the King.

"Et si prendés ces dous frans messagiers,
Pour palefrois lor donés grans destriers,
Et pour lor capes bons mantiax entailliés,
Et a chascun cent livres de deniers."

"And take these two free-born messengers, give them great war-horses for their palfreys, good slashed mantles for their capes, and unto each a hundred pounds in coin."

Here the older MSS end the speech and the youths ride away:

Cil s'en repairent baut et joiant et lié,
Desc'a Paris n'i ot regne tiré.

"They fare forth, bold and joyous and glad; nor did they draw rein till they reached Paris."

But one manuscript adds, after the mother's speech, a repetition quite in the taste of the time:

"Dame," dist Hues, "de gré et volentiers."
Ainsi a fait les mes aparillier:
Pour palefrois lor dona bon destrier,
Et pour lor capes bons mantiax entailliés,
Et a cascun cent livres de deniers.

"'Lady,' quoth Huon, 'gladly and willingly.' So he had the messengers guerdoned: for palfrey he gave them a good war-horse, and for their capes good slashed mantels, and unto each a hundred pounds in coin."

A longer interpolation of the same nature occurs in the rimed versions of the *Chanson de Roland*, after line 1482 of the Oxford version. At the beginning of the second battle in Roncesvaux, the archbishop Turpin exhorts the Christian warriors to fight boldly and to die as martyrs, whereat the French take heart and the fight begins. At this point the later versions insert three *laisses* in which Turpin repeats his exhortation in parallel stan-

zas with change of rime. Do not such parallelistic interpolations resemble the "Doppelfassungen" ⁶⁷ often pointed out in the Homeric poems, such as, for example, P 723-736 compared with P 737-746, or β 214-223 compared with α 281-292?

Interpolation of long passages in the chansons is less common, but more interesting, especially in cases where the passage interpolated is borrowed from, or suggested by, another epic. Thus the conclusion of *Hervi de Metz*, of 71 lines in the original version, is expanded to 1531 lines in two manuscripts, largely to effect a closer connection with the older poem, *Les Lorrains*, from which are borrowed directly several long passages. A redactor of the poem *Gerbert de Metz* has added to it, in one manuscript, a long episode which is really an adaptation, in 784 lines, of the entirely independent epic *Raoul de Cambrai*. This addition is designed to connect Raoul with the family of Gerbert. But the most interesting case of this kind is undoubtedly the interpolation found in MS Venice IV of the *Chanson de Roland*. This MS (14th century, in "Franco-Italian" dialect) contains up to the return of Charlemagne after the revenge for Roncesvaux a text quite similar to that of the Oxford version. At this point however it adds a long narrative of the siege and capture of Narbonne; after which it resumes the narrative found in the other versions. Now this interpolated episode is in substance a shortened and altered version of the chanson *Aymeri de Narbonne*. In view of the suggestion frequently made that the Homeric poems may contain parts or wholes of earlier independent epics, the *Doloneia* in K or the *Nestoris* in A for instance, these proceedings of the Old French redactors present considerable interest.⁶⁸ But it must be added that such passages are uncommon in the chansons. Long interpolations affecting the development of the narrative are rare. And we never find an example in Old French of a poem made up—patchwork fashion—of a number of earlier and shorter lays or epics. When a new poet wished to compose a personal version of an older song, he generally rewrote it entirely.

From the earliest times the chansons know and cite one

⁶⁷ See Wilamowitz, 13, 29, 152, 220, etc.

⁶⁸ See Wilamowitz, 61ff., 198ff., Murray, 201ff., and especially Muelder, *Die Ilias und ihre Quellen*, Berlin, 1910.

another, and many of the later ones are made up of motifs, characters, situations, speeches and lines borrowed from the earlier. The later poets presuppose constantly that their hearers (or readers) possess a knowledge of the old stories. These references to other epic legends are generally inserted by the poet himself into the narrative. So in *Gui de Nanteuil*, 7ff., we are told that Berengier, the "villain" of the story,

si fu niez Guenelon,
Celui qui de Rollant fist la grant traïson,
Qu'il vendi, comme fel, au roy Marcilion,
Dont furent mort a glesve li doze compengnon.

"was the nephew of Ganelon, the man who did the great treason of Roland, whom he sold, the knave, to King Marsile, wherefore the twelve comrades died by the sword," a clear allusion to the *Chanson de Roland*. In the *Chanson d'Antioch* (8, vss. 868ff.) the author refers to three well-known chansons (*Roland*, *Aspremont*, *Aliscans*) when he says:

Les grans peines qu'en ot Oliviers ne Rollans
Ne celes que souffri Iaumons ne Agolans,
Ne li ber Viviens quant fu en Aliscans,
Ne valut a cestui le pris de troi besans.

"The great woes that Roland and Oliver endured, and those which Eaumont and Agolant suffered, and the hero Vivien in Aliscans, were counted far less than this (the woe of the Crusaders at Antioch)."

In the very late chanson, *Hugues Capet*, there is an unmistakable reference to one of the earliest, *Gormont et Isembart*. Or again, in *Renaut de Montauban*, there is an allusion to Girart de Roussillon, interesting because it does not agree exactly with the story told in the chanson of that name. Similarly in Homer we find references made by the poet himself to other epic legends, for example, Od. 15, 225ff., story of Melampus, Il. 2, 628ff., story of Phyleus.

On the other hand, references to other legends put into the mouths of the heroes are less common in the chansons than in Homer. Some examples are found however. In *Jourdain de Blaye* (1426ff.) the hero Jourdain speaks of his grandfather

Ami, summarizing the story of the earlier chanson *Amis et Amiles*, exactly as Glaukos speaks of his grandfather Bellerophon in Iliad Z.

Mis aieuls fu Amis li bons guerriers
 Qu'ocist Hardré le cuivert renoié
 En la bataille por Amile le fier,
 Por Belissant qui ot le cuer legier
 Fille Charlon le fort roi droiturier.

"My grandfather was Ami the good warrior, who slew Hardré, the base renegade, in fight in behalf of the proud Amile for Belissant's sake, the light-hearted daughter of Charles, the strong and righteous king." So, Charlemagne, in the beginning of the chanson, *Huon de Bordeaux*, sums up, apropos of his son Charlot, the story of the *Chevalerie Ogier*, very much as Nestor, in Iliad A 670ff., recounts the deeds of his youth.

Direct borrowings, of one chanson from another, are not uncommon, though it is impossible here to cite more than one or two examples. They begin very early. The author of the *Chanson de Guillaume* has borrowed the motif of the "belles mains" from the *Roland*. *Antioch*, the *Couronnement de Louis* and *Aliscans* "lift" a comparison from the *Roland*, just as we may suppose that the rhapsodes constantly "lifted" similes one from the other.⁹⁹ As for the more extensive borrowings in the later chansons, I can only refer to what is said by the editors of the poems in their introductions.¹⁰

While the chansons de geste thus give evidence that epic poets indulge freely in borrowings and that they do not hesitate to make changes of all kinds, they do not show that an epic is ever constructed out of detached lays or ballads, nor yet made up by the amalgamation of several earlier ones. They also show that it is difficult to detect late and early parts, additions or interpolations, by internal evidence alone. We have seen that such increments do exist in numbers, but if we did not have the manuscripts it is doubtful if their existence could be proved. Some of the tests used by critics seem from this point of view

⁹⁹ See Murray, 208ff.

¹⁰ See especially Stimming, Introd. to his edition of *Boeve de Haumtone*, pp. CLXXXIX ff., G. Paris, Introd. to *Orson de Beauvais*, LV ff., Suchier, Introd. to *Les Narbonnais*, LVI ff.

fallacious. Contradictions, incoherencies and improbabilities, such as have been pointed out in Homer as proof of composite structure, are found in abundance in the chansons in parts where multiple composition can hardly have existed. Slight contradictions in successive passages, such as have been cited as occurring,⁷¹ e. g. Z 448 as compared with 476ff., I 308ff. and 630ff., A 366 and 392, are not uncommon in the chansons and frequently more glaring than anything in Homer. A striking example—change of name—is found in *Huon de Bordeaux*, where Huon's renegade uncle is called first (l. 3881) Guillaume, but becomes (3964) Oedes. In *Gaufrey* we find (p. 180) a "roi de Turfanie" who becomes, two pages farther on, "roi de Piconie." In *Aspremont* (3314) a company of "nos François" is said to number 4000, fourteen lines farther the same band is said to contain 3000. The most striking contradiction of all, the reappearance of a hero killed in a previous fight (as Pylaimenes, killed by Menelaos, E 578 f., turns up alive in N 658) occurs in at least three chansons: namely, in *Elie de Saint-Gilles*, where Corsaut de Tabarie, killed v. 341, reappears alive v. 2428; in *Aye d'Avignon*, where the traitor Auboin is slain v. 736, but resumes his plottings v. 2721; in *Les Narbonnais*, where Gautier le Tolosant, killed v. 7560, reappears v. 7993. Epic minstrels, in works intended to be sung or recited publicly in sections, lay no great stress on consistency or probability. Offenses against either passed unnoticed by their hearers.

Another feature of Homeric style, often adduced as a proof of multiple composition, repetition of messages verbatim, is found constantly in all the chansons, from the earlier (for example, *Chanson de Guillaume*, 636-689, Vivien's summons to William, repeated almost textually by the messenger Girart, 979-1003) to the latest (for example, *Hervi de Metz*, 6415ff., repeated with slight changes 6446ff.). This stylistic peculiarity seems to be natural to such productions, affording no evidence as to authorship.

Repetition of one or several lines, or of whole passages, often noticed in Homer and frequently cited as proof of copying by the "diasceuaists," is also frequent in the chansons, in parts where there is not the slightest evidence of rehandling or addi-

⁷¹ See Cauer, 398ff.

tion by the copyists or redactors. Of this I shall cite examples taken from only one chanson, which shows no trace of being treated by "remanieurs," the *Mort Garin*. Here, for instance, we find line 2559

li fers fu chaus, ne pot l'acier sofrir,

repeated, line 3311,

chaus fu li fers, ne pot l'acier sofrir.

Ibid., lines 2635-36,

Tant mar i fustes, frans chevaliers jentis;
Qui vos a mort, il n'est pas mes amis,

are repeated textually, lines 3364-65, and with a slight variant, lines 4796-97:

Tant mar i fustes, frans chevaliers gentis,
Car vos estiez mes pers et mes amis.

Similarity in situation or in emotion seems to produce similarity in expression, just as with Homer.

Repetition in incident or in motif, frequently objected to in Homer, recurs likewise in the chansons, in passages where no evidence of reworking is otherwise visible. The double council of the gods in *Odyssey* α and ε finds a parallel in the double council of the monks of Aniane in the *Moniage Guillaume II*, 316-343 and 406-439. The three casts at Odysseus⁷² (ρ 462ff., σ 395 ff., υ 301 ff., can be compared to the three adjurations of Oliver in the *Chanson de Roland* (1049ff., 1059ff., 1070ff.). Many more resemblances of this kind could be cited.

Such analytical criticism as the Homeric poems have been subjected to has been applied to several of the chansons, with much the same results. By means of internal discrepancies, lack of motivation, and similar criteria, critics have endeavored to distinguish old and new parts. Hardly ever did any two of these "chorizontes" agree, and since the appearance of M. Bédier's work, they have largely given up this pastime. In one case at least we are able to test their conclusions. The *Chevalerie Vivien* and *Aliscans* were long known to form a single epic, in which appeared many discrepancies and difficulties. The

⁷² See Caer, 490ff.

critics exercised themselves on these, constructing hypothetically the original version of the legend. Then in 1903 came the discovery of the *Chanson de Guillaume*, an authentic "original" version. It confirmed few if any of the results which the critics had reached by internal evidence, presenting in fact a version of the first part of the story which had been entirely unsuspected. It also showed that in some cases the older versions were ruder, more careless and incoherent, than the later, some of the geographical and other difficulties that appear in the *Guillaume* being smoothed away in the later forms. Such a case as this is instructive. When Homeric scholars attempt to show by analytical criticism, as for instance Wilamowitz does,⁷³ just what parts of the *Iliad* were written by Homer, what parts he took from earlier sources, what parts were added by later editors, the student of the chansons can only envy his certainty. The latter poems prove the fact of epic reworkings, interpolations and changes, but they do not afford us any criteria for distinguishing them.

The progress of epic composition, as it went on in medieval France, can be well illustrated by comparing the three forms of the legend of Vivien, to which I have alluded before. The earliest of the three, the *Chanson de Guillaume*, is a poem of 3557 lines, composed early in the twelfth century if not before, not distinguished by a coherent plot or faultless narrative, but containing many superb single scenes and episodes. This was rewritten and expanded by a later poet, of about 1180, into two connected poems, the *Chevalerie Vivien* and *Aliscans*, of 1949 and 8570 lines respectively. In these the sequence of events of the *Guillaume* is preserved, some scattered lines of the original form appearing here and there. The narratives and speeches are lengthened, some new traits are introduced and the geography is altered. A little later, about 1200, a poet of Dammartin-sur-Aube, Herbert le Duc, took many of the characters and the opening scenes of *Aliscans* for the foundation of a new chanson, into which he introduced, following the taste of the time, some new "romantic" elements, and made some important stylistic changes. This version, *Fouques de Candie*, of 18,000 lines, was much admired in courtly circles. It pre-

⁷³ See especially Wilamowitz' analysis of the *Iliad*, 512ff.

serves many of the persons, some situations and motifs, of the earlier versions, but is otherwise an original creation. I have sometimes imagined that an original *Achilleis* may have been expanded and rewritten, by a poet of far greater genius than Herbert le Duc, in much the same fashion.

In conclusion, it may be said that I do not insist on the evidential value of any of these parallels. "Analogies do not run on all fours." Our knowledge of medieval France, the scene of a great religious, social and literary development, is extensive, though incomplete. Our knowledge of pre-classical Greece, especially Ionia, likewise the scene of a great philosophical and artistic development, is only fragmentary. The conditions that surrounded the birth of the epos in the two cases may have been totally different. Nevertheless, the manners and morals of the epic heroes, the motifs and structure of the poems, are so similar that I believe that some importance can be ascribed to these comparisons. Classical scholars must take them for what they are worth. Accepting the chansons as representative epics, however, their answer to the problem of origins is, I think, clear and unmistakable. They are not the result of a long evolution, but arise with comparative suddenness when the social and cultural conditions are ripe, in a period of creative intellectual activity. They then undergo a process of rehandling, copying and alteration, which may last several centuries. Different strata of cultural evolution cannot be distinguished in them individually. They are supposedly true narratives relating to a distant and heroic past, but the figures and costumes of that past are conceived in terms of the present; the heroes dress, act and talk like the poet's contemporaries. The little true history in the poem cannot be distinguished from the fiction. It is rarely if ever possible to detect rehandling by internal evidence alone. So much, I think, the chansons reveal in regard to their own origins.

A final difference between the Old French and the Greek epos has thus far been mentioned only indirectly, and that is the fact that France produced no literary masterpiece. Doubtless, the *Roland*, the *Guillaume*, the *Girart* and a few other chansons are marked by a stern beauty of thought and expression worthy of all praise. But they have never been cherished by their own people, nor accepted by later literary sentiment, as the *Iliad*

and *Odyssey* have. Some scholars, like the late Gaston Paris, have explained this difference as due to the greater creative genius of the Greek mind. But if we consider what was actually accomplished along other lines of creative activity in medieval France, if we think of the crusades, the communes, the schools of philosophy, above all of the marvellous and original art of the great cathedrals, we can hardly doubt that creative genius was as abundant in twelfth-century France as in Homeric Greece. Simply, it did not take a literary form. The genius of Homer, or whoever the poet or poets were who created the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, doubtless with much use of preexisting material, as we have seen that the *chanson* poets created their epos,—that is the main explanation of this difference. To mark the character of that genius, to show by analogy how it developed and worked, that, it seems to me, is the chief contribution of the *chansons* to the study of the Homeric poems.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

For present Homeric criticism, I have relied mostly on the following:

- Cauer, *Grundfragen der Homerkritik*, 2d ed., Leipzig, 1910.
 Drerup, *Omero*, Bergamo, 1910.
 Leaf, *Homer and History*, London, 1915.
 G. Murray, *The Rise of the Greek Epic*, Oxford, 1911.
 Thomson, *Studies in the Odyssey*, Oxford, 1914.
 Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Die Ilias und Homer*, Berlin, 1916.
 For the *chansons de geste*, one may consult:
 J. Bédier, *Les légendes épiques*, 4 vols., Paris, 1908-1913.
 L. Gautier, *Les épopées françaises*, 4 vols., Paris, 1878-1892.
 Groeber, *Franzoesische Literatur*, in *Grundriss der romanischen Philologie*, II, 1, pp. 433-1247, Strassburg, 1902.
 G. Paris, *Histoire poétique de Charlemagne*, 2d ed., Paris, 1905.
 G. Paris, *La littérature française au moyen-âge* ("Manuel"), 3d ed., Paris, 1905.
 Rajna, *Origini dell' epopea francese*, Florence, 1884.
 Voretzsch, *Einfuehrung in das Studium der altfranzoesischen Literatur*, Halle, 1905.
 Wilmotte, *Le Français a la tête épique*, Paris, 1917.

I have used, for reference or citation, the following editions of the epics:

- Homeri Opera*, recog. Monro et Allen, Oxford, 1898.
 Aiquin, ed. Jollon des Longrais, Nantes, 1880.

- Aliscans, ed. Guessard et Montaiglon, Paris, 1870.
 Amis et Amiles, ed. Hofmann, Erlangen, 1882.
 Antioch, ed. P. Paris, Paris, 1848.
 Aspremont, ed. Brandin, Paris, 1919.
 Aye d'Avignon, ed. Guessard et Meyer, Paris, 1861.
 Aymeri de Narbonne, ed. Demaison, Paris, 1887.
 Baudouin de Sebourc, ed. Boca, Valenciennes, 1841.
 Boeve de Haumtone, ed. Stimming, Halle, 1899.
 Chevalerie Ogier, ed. Barrois, Paris, 1842.
 Chevalerie Vivien, ed. Terracher, Paris, 1909.
 Couronnement de Louis, ed. Langlois, Paris, 1888.
 Daurel et Beton, ed. P. Meyer, Paris, 1885.
 Elie de Saint Gilles, ed. Raynaud, Paris, 1881.
 Entrée d'Espagne, ed. A. Thomas, Paris, 1913.
 Fierabras, ed. Kroeber et Servois, Paris, 1860.
 Floovant, ed. Michelant et Guessard, Paris, 1858.
 Fouques de Candie, ed. Schultz-Gora, Dresden, 1909.
 Gaufrey, ed. Guessard et Chabaille, Paris, 1859.
 Gaydon, ed. Guessard et Luce, Paris, 1862.
 Girart de Roussillon, ed. and trans. P. Meyer, Paris, 1884.
 Gormont et Isembart, ed. Bayot, Paris, 1914.
 Gui de Bourgogne, ed. Guessard et Michelant, Paris, 1858.
 Gui de Nanteuil, ed. P. Meyer, Paris, 1861.
 Chanson de Guillaume, ed. Suchier, Halle, 1911.
 Chanson de Guillaume, ed. Tyler, New York, 1919.
 Hervi de Metz, ed. Stengel, Dresden, 1903.
 Hugues Capet, ed. La Grange, Paris, 1864.
 Huon de Bordeaux, ed. Guessard et Grandmaison, Paris, 1860.
 Jourdain de Blaye, ed. Hofmann, Erlangen, 1882.
 Macaire, ed. Guessard, Paris, 1866.
 Moniage Guillaume, ed. Cloetta, Paris, 1906.
 Mort Garin, ed. Du Méril, Paris, 1846.
 Les Narbonnais, ed. Suchier, Paris, 1898.
 Orson de Beauvais, ed. G. Paris, Paris, 1899.
 Otinel, ed. Guessard et Michelant, Paris, 1858.
 Parise la Duchesse, ed. Guessard et Larchey, Paris, 1860.
 Pélerinage de Charlemagne, ed. Koschwitz, Heilbronn, 1883.
 Prise de Cordres, ed. Densusianu, Paris, 1896.
 Prise d'Orange, ed. Jonckbloet, The Hague, 1854.
 Raoul de Cambrai, ed. Meyer et Longnon, Paris, 1882.
 Renaut de Montauban, ed. Michelant, Stuttgart, 1862.
 Chanson de Roland, ed. Mueller, Goettingen, 1878.
 Les Saisnes, ed. Stengel, Marburg, 1906.

W. P. SHEPARD.

II.—THE JUDAS CURSE.

A recent article in this Journal discusses a very formal type of oath, termed by the writer the Judas Iscariot curse.¹ This oath has, however, a very much wider distribution than is there indicated. It consists, in its briefest form, of the wish that the wrong-doer should share the lot of Judas ("habeat portionem cum Iuda"); but, according to the mood of the user, this simple form may be much expanded by allusion to the great sinners of the Bible from Cain to Ananias and Sapphira. Amplified in this fashion, the Judas Iscariot curse becomes a terrifying anathema which can still be increased in effectiveness by hints of what its violator may expect at the Day of Judgment. Yet one suspects that the mediaeval listener to the oath often gave a more attentive ear to the threat of a fine, which the breaking of the oath incurred, than to its appalling phrases. Other imprecations were certainly felt to be more powerful, whereas the Judas curse remained a "formula anathematis minoris."² This fact appears plainly in an old German Chronicle where the Judas curse is the first and least of a long list of penalties arranged climactically. I extract a passage from the chapter in question (which is itself a single sentence extending over one and a third columns folio):

... vnd also soliche uorhorunge gescheen was, so fant sich kuntlich in denselben bullen vnd processen, das derselbe Friderich von dem egenanten consilium dise nachgeschribenn pene anathematis, das man in deutsche sprache nennet *Judas fluch*, dornach in die pene des grossen bannes, in latin genant *sacrilege*, dornach in die pene der berawbunge

¹H. Martin, "The Judas Iscariot Curse," *supra*, XXXVII (1916), 434-451. John Aubrey, the seventeenth-century gossip and antiquarian, was, so far as I know, the first to show any sign of curious interest in the Judas curse. One of his notes reads: "In the grants to the Church by the Saxon King you may see in the Monasticon Angl. many direfull imprecations, as let them that . . . be thrown into the abyss, and let their portione be with Judas Iscariot, &c."—*Remains of Gentilisme and Judaisme*, 1636-1687, Folk-Lore Society, IV (1881), p. 128.

²J. G. Scherzsius, *Glossarium Germanicum Medii Aevi*, Argentorati, 1781, s. v. *Judasfluch*.

aller vnd iglicher lehunge, die er besizet vnd innen haltet, baide von der heiligen kirchen vnd von dem reiche, vnd ander gaistlich vnd werntlich, dornach. . . .³

Solemn, dignified, juristic, and almost always lacking in any suggestion of popular or casual employment, this Judas Iscariot curse is suitable, as Martin (p. 442) says, for use in "political pronouncements, pontifical decrees including decrees of gift, epitaphs, and in poetry." In the following notes I adopt for convenience his arrangement, adding, however, separate headings for its special uses against thieves and for the protection of books.⁴

1. *Political Uses.* During the eleventh century the Judas curse was on one occasion published as widely in France as it had once been in the Roman Empire where Justinian exacted it of his praetorian prefects (Martin, pp. 443-44), for it was contained in the Papal Bull of 1035 proclaiming the Peace of God according to which all men were commanded to lay down their arms in expectation of the second advent of Christ. After

³ Io. Burchardius Menckenius, *Scriptores Rerum Germanicarum praecipue Saxonicarum*, Tomus I (Lipsiae, 1728), col. 1106 (Cap. XLVI of Hist. Imp. Sigismundi). This incident may also be referred to by Birlinger (*Alemannia*, XVI [1888], 63, s. v. *Judenfluech*), but the quotation is too brief to be clear.

⁴ A very curious oath, which may have been used in conversation, is mentioned in a seventeenth-century translation of a Jewish life of Christ, the *Toldoth Yeshua*: "Und alle Weisen der Völker wissen dies Geheimniss, aber sie leugnen es, aber sie fluchen und schelten den Judas Ischariota, und wenn sie Hader und Streit unter einander haben, sagen sie einer dem andern, es geschehe dir, wie Judas Ischariota dem Jesus gethan."—S. Krauss, *Das Leben Jesu nach jüdischen Quellen*, Berlin, 1902, p. 100. The secret here alluded to is the story telling how Christ flew in the air before Queen Helena in order to prove His divinity. Judas rose into the air after Him and overcame his Master by an obscene trick. This episode is regularly found in the *Toldoth Yeshua*, see Krauss, p. 307, s. v. *Luft-Kampf*. It can hardly have been known to Christians, nor would they, even if they had been familiar with it, have thought of turning it into a term of abuse. Another version of the *Toldoth* in alluding to this incident says: "Wegen dieses Ereignisses weinen sie [die Christen] in ihrer Nacht [a pun on Weihnachten] und wegen der That, die Juda an ihm verübte."—Krauss, p. 55. From this it is clear that the author conceives the story as an insult to the followers of Christ. Only Hebrews could have employed the incident in a curse.

the gospel of the day while the tapers were being extinguished to emphasize the solemnity of the scene, the officiating priest read from the psalm at these words:

May they who refuse to obey be accursed, and have their portion with Cain the first murderer, with Judas the archtraitor, and with Dathan and Abiram, who went down alive into the pit. May they be accursed in the life that now is; and may their hope of salvation be put out, as the light of these candles is extinguished from their sight.⁵

An unusual form of the curse occurs in a Greek imprecation against the avaricious, which alludes to the fall of Judas from his lofty position:

Εἴ τις οὖν θελήσει διὰ φιλοχρηματίαν ἢ δι' ἑτέραν αἰτίαν τινὰ καταφρονῆσαι τῶν ἐν τῷ παρόντι χρυσοβούλλῃ λόγῳ τῆς βασιλείας μου διωρισμένων, πρῶτα μὲν τὸ τῆς ἁγίας τριάδος φέγγος, ὅτε παριστάμεθα τῷ φοβερῷ βήματι, μὴ θεάσαιο· ἐκπέσοι δὲ καὶ τῆς τῶν χριστιανῶν μερίδος, ὡς ὁ Ἰούδας τῆς δωδεκάδος.⁶

In an incident recounted by Gregory of Tours (c. 540-594) there appears something which resembles the Judas Iscariot curse and which perhaps belongs here. Bishop Praetextatus was being tried under the statute "*Episcopus in homicidio, adulterio et periurio depraehensus, a sacerdotio divellatur,*" and failed to obtain the favor of King Chilpericus in his defense: "*petiit rex, ut aut tunicam [sic] eius scinderetur, aut centesimus octavus psalmus, qui maledictionibus [sic] Scarioticas continet, super caput eius recitaretur*"—or that it should be decreed against him that he could never receive communion.⁷

⁵ E. C. Brewer, *The Historical Note-Book*, s. v. "Peace of God."

⁶ This passage occurs in the "*Aurea Bulla De Instrumentis Ecclesiarum*" (1148 A. D.) of the emperor Manuel Comnenus; see *Jus graeco-romanum, Pars III, Novellae constitutiones*, ed. Zachariae a Lingenthal, Lipsiae, 1857, Nov. LVI, pp. 443 ff. It is quoted with minor inaccuracies by Solovev, *K legendam ob Iudye predatelye*, Kharkov, 1898, p. 104, n. 1.

⁷ *Historia Francorum*, lib. V (*Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Scriptores Rerum Merovingiarum*, I, i, p. 214). The 108th Psalm here alluded to is now the 109th; the early Fathers thought it referred prophetically to Judas, see, e. g., Origen, *Contra Celsum*, II, 20 (M. S. G., 11, 836-837); Wier (cols. 526 ff.) mentions the psalm particularly in connection with the curse as used against thieves, and Verdham in an excellent essay on charms in general cites a long formula "*Ad*

2. *Ecclesiastical Uses.* Martin remarks that the church rarely employs the Judas curse in the vernacular; and this might be expected, for the formal documents of the church are written almost without exception in Latin. His earliest Latin example dates from 908 A. D., and it is not until the thirteenth century that the curse is written in Spanish. To the eleventh century belongs a long and detailed Greek curse preserved in a set of regulations for a monastery. Since it refers to the hanging of Judas rather than to his lot in Hell, it belongs to a divergent form. In rhetorical effectiveness it does not suffer by comparison with the more familiar type:

Εἰ δέ τις παρὰ τὰ διατεταγμένα παρ' ἐμοῦ ἐπιχειρήσει τι διαπράξασθαι ἢ βασιλεὺς ἢ ἄρχων, εἴτε ἀρχόμενος, εἴτε ἀρχιερεὺς ἢ ἱερεὺς ἢ τι τῶν παρὰ τῆς ἐμῆς ἀρεσκείας ἐντεταλμένων παραβῆναι ἢ ἐφορεῖαν ὅπως ἐν αὐτοῖς ἐνθυμηθῆναι ἢ χαριστικάριον ἄλλον ἐπιστῆσαι ἢ προνοητὴν ἐκτὸς ὧν ἐγὼ μνημονεύσω, ἢ ἀναφορὰν ἢ προχείρισιν προστασίας τινός, (πάσης γὰρ ἐπισκοπῆς ὀρθοδόξων ὀφείλει μνημονεῖν ὁ τοῦ πτωχοτροφείου τοῦ Πανοικτίρμονος ναός), καταραθεῖ ὁ τοιοῦτος ἀπὸ θεοῦ παντοκράτορος καὶ ἐκριζωθεῖ ἐξ ἀνθρώπων ἢ μνήμη αὐτοῦ καὶ καταλάβοι αὐτὸν πένθος καὶ οὐαὶ καὶ προπορεύοιτο αὐτοῦ θλίψις, καὶ δοίῃ αὐτῷ κύριος ὁ θεὸς τὸν τρόμον τοῦ Καῖν, τὴν λέπραν τοῦ Γιεζῆ, τὴν ἀγχόνην τοῦ Ἰούδα καὶ λογισθεῖ ἡ μερὶς αὐτοῦ μετ' ἐκείνων τῶν εἰπόντων· ἄρον ἄρον, σταύρωσον τὸν τοῦ θεοῦ υἱόν· καὶ μὴ ἴδοι ἐπ' αὐτὸν ἐν ἐλέει ὁ παντέφορος ὀφθαλμός, ἀλλ' ἐξαλειφθεῖ ἐκ γῆς τὸ μνημόσυνον αὐτοῦ καὶ κυριευθεῖ ὑπὸ πάντων τῶν ἐχθρῶν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀπαντήσοι αὐτῷ αἰώνιος τιμωρία.⁸

cognoscendum furem" in which the psalm (but not Judas) is mentioned; see "Over Bezweringsformulieren," *Mededeelingen van de Maatschappij der nederlandsche Letterkunde te Leiden over het jaar 1900-1901*, Leiden, 1901, pp. 43-46. The history of the exegesis of this psalm and of its interpretation as prefiguring the death of Judas is of considerable interest.

* Michael Attaliates, Διάταξις, in Miklosich and Müller, *Acta et Diplomata Graeca Medii Aevi*, V (Vienna, 1887), pp. 300-301. It is also printed in Constantinus Sathas, *Μεσαιωνικὴ βιβλιοθήκη*, I (Venice, 1872), 12-13. See further W. Nissen, *Die Διάταξις des Michael Attaliates von 1077*, Jena Diss., 1894; he cites (p. 37) a list of parallels to this curse under the heading: "Schwere Fluchformeln gegen die Uebertreter seiner Vorschriften"; but it does not appear that any of these mention Judas. At the same place he gives also a number of parallels to the freedom of the monastery from secular or ecclesiastical superiors. The

Much later than these is a curious passage in a vernacular decree of the council at Moscow in 1667 which excommunicates schismatics in the following terms:

And may he [who does not believe and who does not truly repent] be excommunicated and unforgiven until death, and may his lot and soul be with Judas Iscariot, the traitor, and with the Jews who mocked Christ, and with Arius, and with other accursed heretics.*

Notwithstanding the gap in space and time this clearly belongs to the same tradition as the usual Western curse: "habeat partem cum Iuda." The Russian oath seems also to follow the model of Michael Attaliates in referring to the Jews who cursed Christ; at any rate I do not find them mentioned in any Western curse.

In the upper Albanian diocese of Achrida (or Ochrida), which claimed and struggled to maintain *autocephalia* or ecclesiastical independence for more than a thousand years and which was alternately dominated by Latin and by Greek missionaries until the final abolition of its freedom by the orthodox patriarch in 1767, the Judas curse was officially employed on at least two occasions. It was appended to a pastoral letter written by the patriarch Joasaph and the synod in 1708. This example is interesting for its mention of the 318 Nicene fathers, who are found with some frequency in the near Eastern formulæ. It is directed against any one who may be led to speak scandal against the monastery and the priest's rulings:

Ὅς δ' ἂν ἀνευλαβεῖα καὶ αὐθαδεῖα οἰστροηλατούμενος κινήσῃ τι σκάνδαλον κατὰ τοῦ ψυχωφελούς καὶ θεαρέστου τούτου ἔργου τοῦ φροντιστηρίου καὶ ποιήσῃ τι παρὰ τὰ διορισθέντα καὶ διαταχθέντα παρὰ τῆς αὐτοῦ ἐνδοξότητος καὶ κοινῇ ψήφῳ ἡμῶν καὶ συνοδικῇ ἀποφάσει ἐπικυρωθέντα, ὁποῖός ἐστιν ὁ τοιοῦτος, ιερῶμενος ἢ λαϊκός, συγγενὴς τῆς αὐτοῦ ἐνδοξότητος ἢ ξένος, ἐγγχώριος ἢ ἐξ ἁλλοδαπῆς, ἀφωρισμένος εἴη ἀπὸ θεοῦ κυρίου παντοκράτορος καὶ καταραμένος καὶ ἀσυγχώρητος καὶ ἄλυτος μετὰ θάνατον. αἱ πέτραι καὶ ὁ σίδηρος λυθήσονται, αὐτὸς δὲ οὐδαμῶς· καὶ εἴη στένων καὶ τρέμων ἐπὶ γῆς ὡς ὁ Κάϊν· κληρονομήσοι τὴν λέπραν τοῦ Γιεζῆ καὶ τὴν ἀγχόνην τοῦ Ἰούδα.

Διάταξις seems to be a very interesting document for the student of folk-lore and mediæval custom; cf. Krumbacher, *Byz. Litt.*², pp. 269-271, 315, 317 or the *Catholic Encyclopedia*, II, 60.

*Quoted by Solovev (p. 104) from *Materialy dlya raskola za pervoe vremya ego suščestvovaniya*, Moscow, 1876, II, 219-220.

τὰ πράγματα καὶ οἱ κόποι αὐτοῦ εἶσαν εἰς ἐξολόθρευσιν καὶ ἀφανισμόν· καὶ προκοπὴν οὐ μὴ ἴδοι, ἔχων καὶ τὰς ἀρὰς τῶν ἁγίων τριακοσίων δέκα καὶ ὀκτὼ θεοφόρων πατέρων τῶν ἐν Νικαίᾳ καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν ἁγίων συνόδων.¹⁰

It seems pretty clear that the curse—at least as it was used in this diocese—was a rather formal thing which did not permit of much variation from the accepted norm. Thus a decade later a very similar oath forms the conclusion of a pastoral letter of the patriarch Kyr Zosimas in which he acknowledges a gift to a school in Kastoria and promises the donor the protection of the patriarch and of the synod. The letter is dated 1719. The curse is as follows:

Ἐπὶ τέλους δέ, εἰ μὲν ἱερώμενος τύχη ὢν, ἐν ἀγίῳ πνεύματι ἀποφαινόμεθα μετὰ πάσης τῆς ἱερᾶς συνόδου, ἵνα γυμνοῦται τῆς ἱερατικῆς αὐτοῦ τάξεως καὶ ἱεροπραξίας, καὶ παντελῶς νὰ καθαίρηται (sic) καὶ νὰ ἀναθεματίζεται καὶ νὰ ἀποστρέφεται ὑπὸ πάντων τῶν εὐσεβῶν καὶ ὀρθοδόξων χριστιανῶν, ὡς ὁ προδότης Ἰούδας, καὶ νὰ καταδιώκεται ὡς λυμὲν τῆς πατρίδος καὶ κοινότητος· εἰ δὲ λαϊκός, ἐστὶ ἀφωρισμένος παρὰ κυρίου παντοκράτορος, κατηραμένος καὶ ἀσυγχώρητος καὶ ἄλυτος μετὰ θάνατον· αἱ πέτραι καὶ ὁ σιδηρὸς λυθήσονται, αὐτὸς δὲ οὐδαμῶς· κληρονομήσῃ τὴν λέπραν τοῦ Γιεζή καὶ τὴν ἀγχόνην τοῦ Ἰούδα, ὡς ἄλλος β' Ἰούδας· νὰ σχισθῇ ἡ γῆ καὶ νὰ τὸν καταπίῃ, ὡς τὸν Δαθὰν καὶ Ἀβηρών· νὰ τρέμῃ καὶ ἀναστενάξῃ, ὡς ὁ Κάϊν, καὶ αὐτὸς καὶ τὰ παῖδιά του καὶ ἡ γυναῖκα του· τὸ μέρος του νὰ εἶνε μὲ τοὺς Ἰουδαίους, ὅπου ἐσταύρωσαν τὸν κύριον τῆς δόξης.¹¹

3. *Legal Uses.* In documents recording gifts or sales of land, the Judas curse often appears; but the fact that the imprecation is usually in Latin, even when the deed is in the vernacular, shows that this clause had become a stereotyped formula. Martin has cited a considerable variety of forms, which bespeaks some freedom in its use. An early example which is mentioned in connection with a gift of Theodetrudes to the monastery of St. Denis in 627 is interesting because of the rhetorical skill in its management:

Propterea rogo et contestor coram Deo et Angelis eius et omni natione hominum tam propinquis quam extraneis, ut nullus contra

¹⁰ H. Gelzer, "Der Patriarchat von Achrida," *Abhandlungen der königlichen sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften*, XLVII (phil.-hist. Klasse, XX), Leipzig, 1902, Part 5, p. 73. He cites another example (which I have not seen) in *Ἱεροσ. σταχ.*, II, p. 325.

¹¹ Gelzer, p. 93.

deliberationem meam impedimentum S. Dionysio de hac re facere praesumat; si fuerit, quia manus suas ad hoc apposuerit faciendo, aeternus rex peccata mea absolvat et ille maledictus in inferno inferiori et anathema et Maranatha percussus cum Iuda cruciandis descendat, et peccatum quem amittit in filios et in domo sua crudelissime plaga ut leprose pro huius culpa a Deo percussus, ut non sit qui inhabitet in Domo eius, ut eorum plaga in multis timorem concutiat, et quantum res ipsa meliorata valuerit, duplex satisfactione fisco egenti exsolvat.¹³

King Eadgar's charter of liberties to Taunton (968 A. D.), which is mentioned but not quoted by Martin, is particularly interesting because the Latin text is accompanied with a briefer, free Anglo-Saxon translation:

Si quis autem praesumptuosus, diabolo instigante, hanc libertatem infringere, minuerere, vel in aliud quam constituimus transferre voluerit, anathema sit, et in Christi maledictione permanens aeterno barathri incendio, cum Iuda Christi proditore ejusque complicitibus miserimus puniatur.

Sy he mid awurgednesse ascyred fram ures Drithnes gemanan and ealra his halgena, and on helle susle ecelice getintragod mid Iudan þe Christes lewa wes.¹⁴

A score of instances, exemplifying the uses of the Judas curse in the province—then the kingdom—of León, can be picked out from a single collection of charters of gift and similar documents.¹⁵ All of them fall between the years 918 and 1034, the limits of the collection. The earliest of these curses (in a deed of Ordoño II to the monastery of Eslonza in 918) is as follows:

Si quis sane temerarius et audax ad inrumpendum conaverit venire, presenti seculo non careat humana vel divina ultionem, et in futuro piceam cum transgressoribus possideat penam et cum Iuda proditore finitis temporibus sit [so]ciaturus.

¹³ Félibien, *Histoire de St. Denys*, Pièces justificatives, No. 2, as cited by Crüwell, "Die Verfluchung der Bücherdiebe," *Archiv für Kulturgeschichte*, IV (1906), 207-208.

¹⁴ Benjamin Thorpe, *Diplomatarium Anglicum Aevi Saxonici*, London, 1865, pp. 234-235. By a slip of the pen Martin ascribes another Anglo-Saxon example of the curse to Queen Æthelred. Her name should be Queen Æthelflæd (the first wife of Æthelred II [the Unready], 978-1016).

¹⁵ Barrau-Dihigo, "Chartes royales léonaises," *Revue hispanique*, X (1903), 356 ff. It will not be necessary to give a page reference for each example, since the year will afford a sufficient identification.

Three years later the clause which becomes a standard form—if any form may be so termed—makes its appearance:

Quod si quisquam ex aliqua generis homo voluerit hanc nostram violare firmitatem, anathematizetur per secula cuncta, et luat penas cum Iuda Domini traditore eterna dampnacione, et ne immunis a dampna secularia videatur, exsolvet quod inquietaverit in duplo et insuper decem libras auri vobis perpetim profuturas.

Characteristic of this are the words "luat penas cum Iuda" which reappear again and again throughout these curses and show a supremacy which is only feebly contested from 960 by a new and more verbose formula. A long curse of 941 is curious for its unusual phrases and still more so for the fact that after more than a generation it is copied verbatim in a similar document of the same monastery. This queer wordy affair must have caught some monk's fancy and when it was his turn to draft a deed he copied the old formula:

Si quis sane ex successoribus nostris vel cuiuslibet alicuius persona, potentior aut inferior, hoc factum nostrum infringere quiverit, quicumque ille fuerit, sit excommunicatus et perpetua confusione multatus in conspectu Dei patris omnipotentis et sanctorum angelorum, apostolorum et martyrum eius, et insuper cum Iuda Domini proditore uno contubernetur in loco in tenebris exterioribus et caligosis, atque pariet tantum et aliud tantum quantum infringere quiverit, et hec scriptura plenam abeat firmitatem.¹²

The imprecation which embellishes the gift of Sancho I to the monastery of Sahagun in 960 is the first to mention the patron saints of the foundation—they occur with considerable regularity in the later curses written at this place—and is couched in an unusually rhetorical style:

Quod si aliquis huius nostre hoblationis temerare presumpserit et huius serie testamenti nostre infringere maluerit, obto, obto per intercessionem patronum meorum Sanctorum Facundi et Primitivi, ille temerator a sinu matris ecclesie seclusum existere, et eternis incendiis cum proditore Christi faciant illum cremare, ultimi examinationis diem non cum celestis paratum possideat gaudium, sed cum reprobis eat in ignem eternum qui diabolo et angelis eius est preparatum, et in corpore vivens propriis careat lucernis a fronte, aures denegent auditum et lingua loquendi careat usum.

¹² This is in a deed of Ramiro II to the monastery of Celanova (*Revue hispanique*, X, 377); compare with it a deed to the same monastery of 985, *ibid.*, p. 425.

Here first appears the phrase "*careat lucernis a fronte*" which becomes very frequent in the later curses. It recurs, for example, in a document of 968:

Si quis autem ex prosapia nostra genusque regale, tam religiosus quam laicus, seu quislibet humani generis homo, hunc votum litationis nostre infringere vel minuere seu inmutare temptaverit, atque post discessum nostrum hanc regiam tenuerit sedem, quicquid talia egerit, inprimis a fronte careat lucernis corpusque eius vermibus scaturiat, et cum sceleratis penas luat tartareas numquam finiendas, et cum Iuda crudelis et Domini proditore sors existat in eternam damnationem, et hanc seriem testamenti quam pro remedio animarum nostrarum fieri elegimus, in cunctis obtineat firmitatis rovoem evo perhenni et usque in finem venturam.

Observe in this the reminiscence of the "*luat penas.*" In 971 the phrase reads: "*et cum Iuda proditore multetur penas in eterna dampnacione,*" and it is very freely handled in a clause of 975:

Si quis igitur deinceps et in subsequentibus temporibus, tan ex clericis quam ex laycis vel cuiuspiam omo asertionis, contra unum factum meum inrumpere vel inmutare temptaverit, inprimis sit excommunicatus et a sacro corpore Domini sit extraneo, ac post mortem cum Iuda qui Dominum tradidit in infernum perpetim luceat, insuper eveniat super eum omnes maledictiones que scriptas sunt in libro Moysei, et pro temporali pena pariet duo auri talenta, et ante scriptura plenam abest firmitate.

In imprecations of 977 and 980 the clause appears with comparatively slight changes. In 986 it is used in conjunction with the "*a fronte careat lucernis*":

Si quis tamen . . . infringere, disrumpere aut disturbare vel extraneare voluerit, inprimis communione corporis et sanguinis Christi, qui est redemptio nostra, extraneus maneat, propriis a fronte careat lucernis, atque cum Iuda Domini proditore anathematus et picea tunica indutus in inferni baratro penas luceat eternas, et a regia hordinatione vel iussione quoartatus, pariare quogatur iuxta goddigam legem auri talenta quinque, et quod desuper scriptum resonat duplare non tardet.

The half-dozen curses which occur in the last fifty years of the period 918-1034 show that systematization had taken place, and as a result all but one contain the clause "*et cum Iuda Domini proditore penas semper luceat infinitas*" (988), or, as the last instance (1034) reads, "*et cum Iuda Domini proditore luat penas in eterna dampnacione.*" By this time—the first quarter

of the eleventh century—the Judas curse had become, so far as the Leonese charters are concerned, an empty, meaningless formula, crystallized in a set phrase. The one imprecation (of 994) which varies from the norm lacks the spirit and zest of the oaths of the earlier generation and only emphasizes the seeming loss of interest in the Judas curse:

Si quis vero quippiam homo . . . exurgere voluerit, ut hanc testationem convellere atque confringere presumat, inprimis sit excommunicatus et perpetua maledictione constrictus, in conspectu Dei Patris omnipotentis et sanctorum omnium angelorum eius sit coram Filio eius Sanctoque Spiritu obnoxius et reus et a cunctorum sanctorum cetu extraneus, atque cum reprobis et condemnatis eternos ignes suscipiatur de stabili in iatu, sive sit vir, sive mulier, multiplicentur tenebras tenebre illius et mors morti eius atque Domini proditoris damna sortitus una mancipientur in pena, et insuper damna temporalia afflictus duplet tantum quantum de hoc testamento auferre voluerit, et vobis perpetim abitura.

An imprecation used to protect a gift from a French monastery in 1053 is remarkable for its mention of Nero, who does not figure so frequently in this collection of villains:

Si quis autem huic largitioni meae contraire aut minuere ex hac re quippiam temptaverit, maledictione Cham, qui patris pudenda deridenda fratribus ostendit, feriat, et cum Dathan et Abiron, quos terra vivos absorbit, et cum Juda traditore, qui se suspendit laqueo, et cum Nerone, qui Petrum in cruce suspendit et Paullum decollavit, nisi resipuerit et ad satisfactionibus remedium confugerit, cum diabolo in inferno poenas luat, donec abiturus veniam eum diabolus est accepturus. Amen.²⁶

In some Slavic deeds to monasteries the Judas curse is found in the vernacular. Thus in a document recording a gift of Stefan Detchanskij in 1327: "And may he be counted with Judas and with those who said, 'His blood on us and on our children.'" ²⁷ And similarly in a deed of Stefan Dushan: "And

²⁶ Guerard, *Cartulaire de S. Père*, I, 222, as cited by Crüwell, *Archiv für Kulturgeschichte*, IV (1906), 208 from Montalembert, *Die Mönche des Abendlandes* (tr. Müller), VI, 42.

²⁷ Šafarik, *Památky drevního písemnictví jeho slovanské, vydání druhé*, 1873, p. 99 (quoted by Solovev, p. 192). The original is: i da iest pričten' s' iyudoyu i rekšikh: kr'v' iego na nas' i na čedekh našikh. [This and other examples credited to Šafarik are taken from Solovev, since Šafarik's book is inaccessible to me.]

may he be counted with Judas the betrayer of Christ and with those who said: 'His blood on us and our children.'"¹⁸ Arius is mentioned in a deed of St. Lazar: "And may he be counted with Judas and Arius and those, who said: 'His blood on us and on our children.'"¹⁹ Similar imprecations are noted twice by Solovev in the documents of the Bulgarian emperor, Jan Šišman: "And may he share the lot of Judas the betrayer of the Lord, and inherit the leprosy of Gehazi" or "May he have the lot of Judas and Arius."²⁰ Solovev comments: "It is curious that Judas is mentioned alone in the earlier deeds and in the later [we find] Judas and Arius. How is this to be explained? Is it impossible to find an explanation in the history of the South Slavic church? I have not enough material to decide this question." It is hardly necessary to look for a reason in the church history of a particular nation; as time passed the heresy of Arius was more and more generally and severely denounced by Athanasians. The same curse is found in France, e. g., "cum Iuda Scarioth Caifanque, Arrio atque Sabellio in inferno penas sustineat" or "cum Iuda proditore et Simone Mago et Arrio et Sabellio et Aman et Oloferno demergatur in inferno" (Martin, p. 436, n. 1).

4. *Special Uses against Thieves.* John Wier, who wrote a long treatise on witches at the end of the sixteenth century, terms the Judas curse "anathema sancti Adalberti"²¹ and de-

¹⁸ Šafarik, p. 103: i da ie pričten' iyude predatelyu Khristovu i tem rekšim': kr'v' ego na nas' i na čedekh' našikh'.

¹⁹ Šafarik, p. 108: i da ie pričten' iyude i arii i tem, iže rekoša: krov' ego na nas i na čedekh' našikh.

²⁰ Šafarik, p. 109: i pričestie da imat' s iyudoš predatelem gospodinem, i prokažā giezivādo naslēduet'; and: i s' iyude i arie česti da zimat.

²¹ To Professor Hepding of Giessen I am indebted for the suggestion that the "anathema S. Adalberti" may not refer to the famous saint but to Bishop Adalbert or Aldebert who was condemned as a heretic in 745 at the instance of Boniface. (See Herzog-Hauck, *Realencyklopädie d. Theologie*; the documentary account may be found in Schannat and Hartzheim, *Concilia Germaniae*, I, 60 ff.) This Adelbert or Aldebert was honored by the folk as a saint. He circulated a "Himmelsbrief" and a prayer in which the names of angels occurred and which the Pope termed devilish. The recollection of his magical powers persisted among the folk and his name may very easily have become attached to such a formula as the Judas curse. Professor Hepding remarks that he

clares that its use to regain stolen property is open to condemnation as impiety. He then gives with some comment a very elaborate curse (and charm) of 112 short lines, which is briefly as follows:

Ex autoritate Dei omnipotentis . . . sancti Adalberti & omnium Confessorum . . . excommunicamus, damnamus, maledicimus uinculo anathematis, & à liminibus sanctæ matris Ecclesiæ segregamus illos fures, sacrilegos . . . sit pars eorum cum Dathan & Abiron, quos terra propter eorum peccata & superbiam deglutiuit: sit etiam pars illorum cum Iuda traditore, qui Dominum precio uendidit, Amen: & cum Pontio Pilato, & cum eis qui dixerunt Domino Deo, Recede à nobis, uiarum tuarum scientiam nolumus: fiant filij eorum orphani: sint maledicti in ciuitate . . . maledictum caput eorum, ora, nares . . . uiscera omnia. . . . Adiuro te Lucifer cum omnibus satellitibus tuis, cum Patre & Filio & Spiritu sancto, & cum humanitate & natiuitate Christi, & cum uirtute omnium sanctorum, ut nullam habeas requiem diebus neque noctibus, donec perducas eos ad interitum . . . & sicut Dominus beato Petro apostolo & eius successoribus, quorum uices tenemus, & nobis quamuis indignis potestatem contulit . . . & sicut candela de manib. meis eiecta extinguitur, sic opera eorum & animæ eorum in foetore barathri extinguantur, nisi reddant quod furati sunt, infra certum terminum.*

The omitted passages are simply expansions or variations of the preceding ideas. Wier found particularly offensive the fact that Lucifer and his satellites are called upon along with the powers of light: "Quæ communicio Christo cum Belial?" (2 Cor. 6) he observes. Furthermore, Christ gave Peter the keys of Heaven (Matth. 16), but not the right to blaspheme: "Non blasphemorum eiusmodi anathematum fulmina concessit, multo minus mandauit." These opinions concerning the Judas curse (as employed against thieves) seem to have been held with some tenacity, for Frommann in his curious volume *De Fascinatione Magica* of about a century later digests the objections as follows:

De hoc anathemate quid sit iudicandum Freudius *Quæst.* 221 ex Brochmanno & aliis Theologis proponit ita: In hoc anathemate (1) fur

later found that this suggestion of his had been anticipated. M. Delrio in the *Disquisitionum magicarum libri VI* comments as follows: Alii utuntur exorcismo seu anathemate, quod blaspheme vocant S. Adalberti. . . . Quam prorsus suspicor esse illius Adelberti hæretici, qui se sanctum vocabat et damnatus fuit à Papa Zacharia. (Mainz edition, 1624, p. 469.)

* J. Wierus, *De præstigiis daemonum*, Basel, 1583, cols. 522-524, lib. V, cap. vi, "Ut Res furto sublata restituatur, anathema magicum."

eternæ morti, & damnationi adjudicatur, cum Christianus etiam inimicis bene precari debeat, Matth. 5. 44. quod contra naturam anathematis est, cujus finis est, ut homo carne afflicto salvetur in die adventus Jesu Christi 1. Cor. 5 (2) junctim invocatur S. Trinitas, Maria, Apostoli &c. quod Idololatria est (3) junctim quoque adjuratur Lucifer, & Deus & uterque in vindictam pari jure imploratur, quod est colere Diabolum, & Deum abnegare, Deo simul & Diabolo servire, communionem Christi & Belial introducere.²³

This employment of the Judas curse is particularly interesting because the curse was traditionally used as a protection against book-thieves. From the association of Judas with thievery, which was already present in every one's mind, and which was reinforced by this imprecation and the accepted exegesis of Psalm 109, there arose a curious charm which compares the sufferings of Judas at the betrayal to the sufferings invoked upon the thief's head and by means of these pains it is hoped that he will be forced to return the stolen goods.²⁴ An anathema of the bishop of Czernowitz in 1786 makes the development of the Judas charm against thieves clearer. Dosothei, by the grace of God Bishop of the imperial Bukovina, learned that one Theodor Halip, priest in the village of Oprischni, had lost by theft four oxen, one mare, and one heifer, and that further the villager Basil Stratulat had complained of the disappearance of eleven horses and six oxen. Since his soul "could not endure these injuries and the despicable sins of these thefts, which had been committed by wretched people without fear of God," he cursed the guilty ones and their accomplices by virtue of the power entrusted to him by God and our Savior (this is the clause at which Wier and Frommann balked) in the following fashion:

That all of them—thieves and accomplices—should be cursed by God the Lord, the just Judge and Savior, Jesus Christ, by His most pure mother, by the twelve apostles, by the 318 fathers of the council at Nicaea, and all saints. Iron, ore, and stone and all hard substances should decay, but their bodies should persist uninjured and undissolved after death! In eternity their souls should partake with Judas of eternal torments, but in this world the wrath of God should rest upon them and be poured over them and their children: They should have

²³ J. C. Frommann, *Tractatus de fascinatione Novus et Singularis*, Norimbergae, 1675, pp. 708-709.

²⁴ See my paper, "Judas Iscariot in Charms and Incantations," *Washington University Studies*, VIII (1920), Humanistic Series, 1, 3-17.

no success in life, their labors and efforts should accomplish their destruction. . . . The tremor of Cain and the sores of Gehazi should cling to their bodies. . . . Those who know and disclose the evildoers shall be pardoned, and they shall be blessed by God, the Lord. So may it be.²⁶

A queer formula employed against thieves which was written down in a German recipe-book in Baden in 1727 is half anathema and half spell. Beginning with an allusion of magical flavor, it continues with a phrase intentionally reminiscent of the powers conferred on St. Peter (Matth. 16: 19) and its conclusion is likewise half incantation and half curse. Noteworthy is the comparison of successive states of the thief's mind to successive states of Judas' mind at the betrayal. This apparently unusual formula is as follows:

Ich beschwöre dich bey Maister Arbegast, der allen dieben ein Maister was, der sei bundten und knipft und nimmermer aufgelöst biss ahn jüngsten tag. da soll dir so bandt sein als dem Judas wahr, da er unser lieber herr Jesus Christus verkaufft hat, so bandt sol dir sein dieb und diebin; wan du wilt stehlen das mein, so solst du gefangen und gebunden sein; da solt so wenig ruoh haben als Judas hat, da er unserm lieben herrn Jesum Christum einen falschen kuss gab, so bang sol dir sein dieb. . . . Du dieb oder diebin solt wenig weichen von meinem guot, biss dass du mir kannst zehlen die staudten, die über die erden ausluogen, du muost mir bei meinem guoth still stahn, biss unser liebe frau ein andren Sohn gebehrt und ich dich in des Teuffels namen urlaub geb im nahmen Gottes vatters und des Sohnes und des hl. Gaists. amen.²⁷

5. *Special Uses against Book Thieves.* Ecclesiastics in the Levant and in Europe used various imprecations, some of them containing the name of Judas, to protect the books of their libraries from theft. Crüwell, who has collected the continental examples,²⁷ believes that they were suggested originally by the

²⁶Kaindl, "Beiträge zur Volkskunde Osteuropas," *Zeitschrift des Vereins für Volkskunde*, XXVII (1917), 240-241, No. 20, "Fluchbrief gegen Diebe" (quoted from F. A. Wickenhauser, *Geschichte des Bistums Radautz*, I, 191 ff.).

²⁷Birlinger, "Volkstümliches aus der Baar [Baden]," *Alemannia*, II (1875), 128, No. 4.

²⁸"Die Verfluchung der Bücherdiebe," *Archiv für Kulturgeschichte*, IV (1906), 197-228. That the book-curse has not yet outlived its former usefulness is apparent from the experience of Gelzer, who had difficulty in obtaining a manuscript that had been stolen from the

author's curse against the falsifiers of his text. The damnation threatened against the stealer of a book is a corollary to the notion that the copier of a manuscript had earned a claim on eternal happiness; and in their beginnings, says Crüwell, the expression of the one idea is roughly contemporary with that of the other. The Church took no decided position in the matter, in particular it did not definitely favor the use of curses to prevent the theft of books, and consequently some monasteries never made use of them. Others seem to have a tradition of some antiquity favoring the curse. The fashion of the Judas curse in this use seems to have originated, so far as the Occident is concerned, at Monte Cassino, the oldest of the Benedictine monasteries, and to have spread from there into the Benedictine monasteries of France. On the first page of a ninth-century manuscript of the *Historia tripartita* of Cassiodorus belonging to Monte Cassino the thief is cursed in this way:

Si quis nobis hunc librum quolibet modo malo ingenio tollere temptauerit aut uoluerit, sit anathema maranatha, et cum Juda traditore domini triginta maledictiones iuxta numerum triginta argenteorum quibus dominum uendidit quae in centesimo octauo psalmo scriptae reperiuntur. Has omnes maledictiones et hic et in aeternum possideat, qui hunc ut dictum est nobis tollere maluerit.²⁸

The standard Benedictine curse is, however, shorter and makes no mention of the 109th (formerly 108th) Psalm, which was thought to prefigure the fate of Judas. In the Benedictine monasteries of eastern France (Tours, St. Mesmin de Micy, St. Fleury) the formula seems to have run much as follows:

Hic est liber Sancti Benedicti abbatis Flōriacensis coenobii; si quis eum aliquo ingenio non redditurus abstraxerit, cum Juda proditore, Anna et Caipha atque Pilato damnationem accipiat! Amen.²⁹

monastery. See his account in "Der wiederaufgefundene Kodex des hl. Klemens," *Berichte über die Verhandlungen d. k. sächs. Gesell. d. Wiss. zu Leipzig*, Phil.-hist. Klasse, LV (1903) p. 61.

²⁸ A. Reifferscheid, "Bibliotheca Patrum Latinorum Italica, V-IX," *Sitzungsberichte der Wiener Akademie, phil.-hist. Klasse*, LXXI (1872), 88.

²⁹ Cf. Crüwell, p. 214; L. Delisle, *Catalogue des manuscrits des fonds Libri et Barrois*, p. 30. The example above is taken from MS. Fonds Libri 92 (now Bibliothèque Nationale, Nouv. acq. lat. 1597), a collection of extracts from St. Gregory in an eighth-century hand. A slightly

Ludwig Traube has collated 28 manuscripts which once belonged to the monastery of St. Mesmin de Micy in order to arrive at a "critical" text of the curse, which does not vary essentially from that above (19 of his examples contain the "cum Juda").³⁰ The manuscripts of the Benedictine monastery of St. Victor in Paris contained, says Crüwell, the Judas curse. It is also to be found, according to Traube, in a manuscript of St. Martin of Tours which is now in England (MS Egerton 2831). The combination of Ananias, Caiaphas, and Judas occurs also in the Brendan legend, where it may have been suggested by the oath.³¹

Brief and to the point is a rhyming curse in an old German manuscript: "Qui te furetur, cum Juda dampnificetur."³¹

I have noted two examples of the Judas curse against book thieves in Greek,—enough to show that others undoubtedly exist. These are particularly important since they are separated by several centuries, one being of the early eleventh century, the other of the fourteenth. In form they, like the other Greek and Levantine examples, differ sufficiently from the Latin type to prove that they represent a parallel tradition rather than a translation from a Western formula. The continued existence of this parallel tradition may be demonstrated by a comparison between the anathema of Bishop Dosothei cited above and the second of these Greek book-curses; observe in both the mention of the three hundred eighteen Nicene Fathers, who are not found in the Western formulæ. The earlier of the two curses occurs in a manuscript of Symeon Metaphrastes, dated in the colophon A. D. 1105:

Ὅστις οὖν βουληθῇ ἄραι τήνδε τὴν βίβλον ἀπὸ ταύτης τῆς μονῆς, ἢ εὐλόγως ἢ ἀνευλόγως πρῶτον μὲν κληρονομίῳ ἀνάθεμα, τὴν ἄρὰν τῶν ἁγίων θεοφόρων πατέρων, καὶ ἡ μαρὶς αὐτοῦ μετὰ Ἰούδα τοῦ καὶ προδότου καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν ἀποστατῶν.³²

different curse in Martène, *Voyage littéraire de deux religieux Bénédictins de Ste. Maur*, Paris, 1717, p. 68 omits Pilate and reads "portionem aeternae damnationis." The writer says that it headed a ninth-century book of sacraments.

³⁰ *Hieronimi chronicorum cod. Flor.*, p. xvi.

³¹ On Judas in the Brendan story see Dr. Paull F. Baum's *Judas' Sunday Rest*, which is to appear in the *Modern Language Review*.

³² Wattenbach, *Schriftwesen*, 3rd ed., p. 528 (Hoffmann von Fallersleben, *Altdeutsche Handschriften*, p. 232).

³³ B. de Montfaucon, *Palaeographia Graeca, sive de ortu et progressu literarum Graecarum*, Paris, 1708, pp. 57-58, Codex Colbertinus 25. The monastery was in Constantinople.

Codex Colbertinus 10, of the fourteenth century, containing an *Interpretatio in Psalmos*, ends with the following curse:

Εἴ τις τοῦτο [the volume] ἐξαιρήσῃ ἀνευ τὴν γνώμην τοῦ Ἀρχιεπίσκο-
 πῶν, καὶ ἔχῃ τὴν θέλαν καὶ ζωποιοὺν καὶ ἀσύγχυτον καὶ ἀδιαίρετον τριάδα,
 καὶ τὴν παναγίαν τοῦ αὐτοῦ μητέρα, τοῦ τιμίου ἐνδόξου προφήτου προδρό-
 μου καὶ βαπτιστοῦ Ἰωάννου, τῶν τιμ. θεοφόρων πατέρων, καὶ πάντων
 σου [?] τῶν ἁγίων ἀμοιβήν, καὶ καὶ τὸν καταξέδ (sic) ἐν Σοδομογομορ-
 ρας ὡ ἀγχόνι Ἰούδα ἀνάθεμα.²³

In a Syriac manuscript in the St. Petersburg Public Library there is a remarkable passage which indicates that the Judas curse was known in the Levant in a form practically identical with that current in the West. The following words are written in Arabic letters on the fly-leaf:

This blessed book belongs to the church of the monastery of Sinai, and whosoever takes it away or tears a leaf from it, may the Virgin be a foe to him and may his fate be one with the fate of Judas Iscariot.²⁴

This example is not dated by Solovev, but the curse appears again in a very similar form in an Arabic manuscript which is ascribed for palæographic reasons to the fourteenth century. The manuscript in question, containing New Testament Apocrypha, belongs to the convent of Deyr-es-Suriani or St. Mary Deipara in the Wady Natrôn, Egypt. In it a colophon, which is inserted at the end of the "Martyrdom of St. Andrew," runs as follows:

And praise be to God ever and always. This blessed book is the enduring perpetual guarded inheritance of the Monastery of Our Lady, the Lady whose lord is Anba Bishai, and is known as the Syrian Fathers. And no man shall have power from the Lord—praise be to Him!—to take it out of the Monastery on any pretence or by way of

²³ Montfaucon, pp. 75-78. "Hæc Græco-barbara, imo penitus Bar-
 bara," says Montfaucon, "hunc sensum habent: si quis eum sine Archi-
 epæ nutu abstulerit, incurrat maledictionem sanctæ Trinitatis, sanctæ
 Deiparæ, s. Joan. Baptistæ, SS. 318. Patrum Nicænorum et omnium
 Sanctorum, sortem Sodomæ et Gomorrhæ, laqueum Judæ, anathema." Though the Greek is not the best Attic, one may suspect that some of the blame attaches to the editor; the "[sic]" is his, and apparently a few more are needed; the "[?]" is mine.

²⁴ Solovev, p. 104, n. 1 (quoted from *Otchet Imperat. Pub. Bibl.* 1883, p. 184).

loss. And after he shall have taken it out his lot shall be with Judas, the betrayer of his Lord. And it was written for God's sake by permission of our Father, the Metropolitan Abbot of the Monastery above mentioned. And praise be to God always and for ever."

6. *Literary Uses.* Examples of the literary employment of the Judas curse are extremely rare.³⁶ Martin notes but three, all from the Spanish chronicles and romances, "where heroic style prevailed and conventionality was in order." An instance earlier than any of these may perhaps be seen in an allusion by Gregory of Tours to the 108th Psalm (now the 109th) and its interpretation as forecasting the fate of Judas. He says in the *Vita S. Abbadi*: if any one doubts his testimony, "et hic et in aeternum per virtutes sancti et beati domini Martini sit excommunicatus et anathematizatus, et veniat illa maledictio, quam psalmus CVIII continet in Judam Scariotis."³⁷ The solemnity of the oath is much emphasized in the *Klage* of Hartmann von Aue, one of the first of the great mediaeval German poets (fl. 1190). Here it is accompanied with a formal gesture, and the context indicates that it was spoken. The passage is as follows:

Ich hân die vinger uf geleit
unde swer dir's einen eit:
ich bite mir got helfen sô,
daz ich iemer werde vrô
oder iemer gewinne
deheine werltminne
oder dehein ere,
niwan daz ich mit sere
mûeze leiten mîn leben
und dem ein unreht ende geben
und daz diu arme sêle mîn
êweclîchen mûeze sîn
in der tiefen helle
Jûdases geselle,

³⁶ Agnes S. Lewis, *Horae Semiticae*, IV, "The Mythological Acts of the Apostles," London, 1904, p. 29.

³⁷ Polixenes' oath in the *Winter's Tale* may possibly be descended from the traditional form. He swears that Hermione is virtuous; calling down on his head these consequences if he speaks falsely:

O, then my best blood turn
To an infected jelly, and my name
Be yoked with his that did betray the Best!

—Act I, sc. ii, 417.

³⁸ M. S. L. 71, 1149.

da nieman fröude haben mac,
 unz an den jungesten tac,
 und daz si dannoch niht ensi
 vor des tiuvels banden fri.²⁸

There is at least one instance of literary employment of the Judas curse in the Near East. In an Armenian version of the Debate of the Body and Soul the body counsels the soul to seek worldly pleasures. The soul recommends a very different course of life and "curses the body with the imprecation of Cain and Judas," but the body is unheeding.²⁹

Into such various languages as Old Church Slavic, Russian, Arabic, and Armenian the Judas curse has made its way—a distribution which accords well with the fact that its first reported use was Justinian's exaction of it from his officials. Although it was widely used—and its employment in the vernacular seems to have been rather more frequent in the Eastern Empire than in the Western—it is nonetheless a bookish imprecation, transmitted by the Church and most often found in connection with the Church, its affairs and its belongings. In the West it seems later not to be highly regarded—compare the German chronicler Menckenius with the Middle High German poet,—but in the East I have observed no evidence of its comparative importance. There it was doubtless used for what it may have been worth.

ARCHER TAYLOR.

WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY,
 ST. LOUIS, MO.

²⁸ F. Bech, *Hartmann von Aue*, II (*Deutsche Klassiker des Mittelalters*, V), Leipzig, 1891, *Die Klage*, vss. 1421 ff. The passage is erroneously cited by Solovev (p. 116) as an example of the "Judas-lied," a mocking song about Judas which was popular during the Reformation. On the Judas-song see my discussion in the *Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, XIX (1920), 318-339.

²⁹ Solovev, p. 104, n. 1 (quoted from Th. D. Batiushkov, *Spor duši s tyelom*, 1891, pp. 230-231). See also Batiushkov, "Le Débat de l'âme et du corps," *Romania*, XX (1891), 548 where the curse is not specifically mentioned as such in a brief summary of the Armenian text: "Elle [l'âme] lui [le corps] rappelle le sort de Caïn et de Judas." In order to be entirely certain about this passage it would be necessary to verify the reference to Batiushkov's book, but this I have been unable to do. Unfortunately the quotations made by Solovev are not always accurate.

III.—VULGATE HOMERIC PAPYRI.

Since the publication of my articles¹ on the latest stages in the tradition of the Homeric poems, a number of papyri have been printed; to others, which were then inaccessible, I have now gained access; and, thanks to W. Schubart, *Einführung in die Papyruskunde*, pp. 478-480,² I have become aware of a number of omissions in my lists of papyri. The purpose of the present article is to use this additional material as a test for the theory that I have proposed of the origin of our Homeric text.

I feel that I can proceed immediately to this task without pausing to examine in detail the little investigation entitled *Zu den Homer-papyri* and published in BPhW. 36 (1916), Sp. 1281-1287, by Walter Müller with the intention of refuting this theory as known to him from the first of my articles.³

¹ *The Archetype of our Iliad and the Papyri*, American Journal of Philology 35 (1914) 125-148; *The Latest Expansions of the Iliad*, ibid. 37 (1916) 1-30; and *The Latest Expansions of the Odyssey*, ibid. 452-458. These will be cited hereafter simply by the pages.

² The best acknowledgment of my indebtedness is to point out the few serious faults I have found in this list. "¶ 22-447 3p Sächs G Wiss 1904" must be Δ 22-447 3p published by Blass in the *Berichte* (not the *Abhandlungen*) d. Kgl. Sächs. Ges. d. Wiss., Phil.-hist. Klasse, 1904, p. 211. The following are omitted: P. Romanus N 143-150 1 a *Rendiconti della Accad. dei Lincei*, 2 (1893), p. 831, and the Aberdeen papyri, B 687-695, 760-778, Δ 199-211, H 60-68, I 356-378, ¶ 1-26, 58-65, X 265-272, *Class. Quart.* 1 (1907) 257 ff. What is described as a 'fragment' of ρ contains in reality 34 lines.

³ Of the 22 passages employed by Müller to test my theory, one, the Catalogue of the Ships, is irrelevant (it shows merely that in antiquity as well as in the Middle Ages there were people who did not regard it as worth while to copy this section); another, E 83, is an error, no papyrus omitting the line; four more, published by the Società Italiana, will be treated in this article; while the remaining 16 were all discussed in my second article. A comparison of it will show that the reason Müller did not find here a confirmation of the theory was his failure to distinguish properly between the accidental and the significant omissions in the papyri—only Θ 183, X 363 and perhaps Γ 235 coming under the latter class. Of minor details I may gratefully note: B 168 is unquestionably omitted by P. Bodl. a1(P); Δ 313 is not added by a second hand in P. Morgan (I should therefore shift it from the certain to the probable instances of surface corruption); N 46 is not added by

In general, however, I may point out that I do not date all these interpolations *im ausgehenden Altertum* or later. On the contrary I believe (cf. especially pp. 19 f., 20 f., 24, 30, 458) that the process of interpolation began almost immediately after the appearance of the vulgate in about 150 B. C. Consequently my expectation that a certain interpolation will not be found in the papyri is not based upon the belief that no copy of Homer containing that line was ever written before 600 A. D. My belief is that an interpolation—if it is of earlier date—had by the year 600 extended to so few copies of the poems that the chance of finding a papyrus containing it is extremely slight. This chance is not equal for all interpolations, but varies according to the date at which the interpolation was first made, and the date of the papyrus in question. Nor do I believe that the early copies would fall into two sharply marked classes, those with, and those without, interpolations. Rather would they vary from passage to passage; for each interpolation is a separate fact, and the whole process is to be conceived very much as Johannes Schmidt pictured in his *Wellentheorie* the rise and spread of linguistic changes.

The new material⁴ gives us for the Odyssey 292 lines, for

a second hand in P. Brit. Mus. 732; 2 200-201, 427, and 441 are added in P. Brit. Mus. 107 by a second hand. I may add that the second hand of P. Oxy. 223 in correcting the accidental omission of E 75 has marked it to be inserted after E 83.

One passage must be criticised briefly. "Eine Nachprüfung ergibt jedoch eine Korrektur, indem nämlich an zwei Stellen ein Papyrus einen Vers auslässt, den ein anderer Papyrus doch bietet: B 168 fehlt in Pap. Mus. Br. 136 (read 126) und Pap. Bodl. a 1, steht dagegen in Pap. Soc. Ital. 137; Θ 6 fehlt in Pap. Goodspeed 7 (Washim), steht aber in Pap. Mus. Br. 136." As a matter of fact P. Soc. Ital. 137 omits B 168; while P. Brit. Mus. 136 does not contain the beginning of Θ but only parts of ΓΔ. One thinks naturally that this is a misprint for P. Brit. Mus. 736 (the only other papyrus covering the beginning of Θ), but this also omits the line in question. The material brought to refute my statement serves but to support it.

⁴For abbreviations not used previously, cf. Schubart. The following papyri are mentioned so briefly that it is impossible to use them: Fragg. ABΔΘAP Ken P 139 | Fragg. Θ 2 a Arch Rep 95/6 p. 17 | Fragg. o Sayce Ac 1894 May 12 p. 401. That condition is approximated by A 298-333 1/2 p P Bodl e 58, but I have assumed that any important omission would have been mentioned in Ken P 139. Two papyri are still inac-

189 of which papyrus evidence was previously not available.⁵ My list II^a of certain interpolations (p. 453) is tested but at three points ρ 233^a (Ac B Lettres 1905) ρ 603^a (Oxy VI 955) and ψ 320 (Oxy VI 956). All three of these lines are omitted; the omission of ψ 320 by P. Ryl. 53 had previously (p. 456) been observed. These papyri afford no test of list II^b (p. 453) of probable interpolations. They test list III (p. 454) at four points ι 361, 406 (Oxy XI 1396), ρ 601, σ 39 (Oxy VI 955); and always, like those previously employed, contain the line in question, thus confirming my conclusion (p. 457) that the list is surface corruption. No other lines are omitted by these papyri, nor are there any cases of additions or transpositions of lines. The evidence is thus exactly what my theory demands.⁶

Of the *Iliad* this additional material contains 1223 lines, of which 260 had not been previously found in papyri.⁷

cessible: B 494-678 6p Cairo Byz II 141, and the Vienna portions of P Brit Mus 271 containing parts of the third book of the *Odyssey*.

^a α 266-276 296-307 5p Oxy XI 1394 | γ 435-449 1p Soc It II 122 | δ 97-100 197-204 222-224 248-261 2p Oxy VI 953 | ε 106-113 1p Soc It I 8 | ζ 146-171 2p Hal 5b | 264-75 294-305 4p Oxy XI 1395 | ι 358-361 364 405-408 410-412 5p Oxy XI 1396 | μ 344-352 h Hal 5a | ξ 299-303 328-332 4/5p Oxy VI 954 | ο 329-333 362-366 4/5p Soc It I 9 | ρ 200-209 228-234 301-308 324-332 4p Ac B Lettres 1905 p. 215 | ρ 601-606 3p Oxy VI 955 | σ 27-40 3p Oxy VI 955 | σ 67. 70 5p Oxy XI 1397 | φ 356-367 3p Oxy XI 1398 | ψ 309-326 342-356 2/3p Oxy VI 956 | ω 421-445 2/3p Soc It II 115.

⁶ I may note in passing that Landwehr, *Phil.* 44 p. 586, argues that in the papyrus there published some verses between ξ 87 and ξ 373 were omitted. His suggestion that these were 159, 162-164, lines attacked by the Alexandrian critics, can now be definitely rejected. The space is too large, cf. Blass, *Itpl.* p. 153, to permit exact calculation; but it is hardly a mere coincidence that I have designated ξ 369-370 as certain interpolations.

⁷ A 129-150 2p P Brit Mus 272 | 173-187 2p Freib 5 | 298-333 1/2p P Bodl e 58(f) | 357 413 439-479 (457-458 inferred) 492-493 503-514 5p Soc It II 113 | B 158-174 179 (implied) 3p Soc It II 137 | 220-223 1p Arch V 379 | 381-392 2p Lefebvre | 444-446 456-467 5p Oxy XI 1385 | 836-852 864-877 2/3p P Brit Mus 886 | Δ 22-49 79-100 424-447 3p Blass, *Ber Sächs Gesell* 1904, 211 | 50-66 4/5p Soc It I 11 | 257-271 3p Oxy XI 1386 | E 206-224 2p Oxy XI 1387 | 265-289 3/4p P Berol 11636 (from facsimile AB 1913 p. 219, the reverse is said to contain 287-317) | 554-561 566-569 601-610 (and two fragments) 3p Wess Stud V | Z 133-150 156-160 1a Oxy XI 1388 | H 182-194 218-230 250-255 285-289

In this material there are a number of 'surface corruptions.' For the confusion affecting A 357 456-458 505-507 511 in P. Soc. It. 113; I 4 in BCH 28; A 603-604 610 in P. Tebt. 266; A 637-641 in P. Oxy. XI 1391; and A 642-644 648-649 in P. Soc. It. 10 reference to the original publications may suffice.⁸ The other examples are: A 55 om. it. P. Soc. It. 11 add. im. m. 2.⁹—H 358 post vm. 359 iteravit P. Soc. It. 114 (dittography . . . ἀγορεύεις, . . . ἀγορεύεις)—K 258-261 om. P. Soc. It. 13 (hapl. . . . ἔθηκε, . . . ἔθηκε)—A 639 om. P. Soc. It. 10, il. add. m. 1—M 27/28 om. P. Soc. It. 10, im. corr. m. 1¹⁰—N 800 om. P. Soc. It. 10 (hapl. . . . ἄλλα, . . . ἄλλοι)—Σ 617 cum. v. l. iteravit Mel. Nic.—X 24-26 om. P. Soc. It. 139 (hapl. . . . πεδίω, . . . πεδίω)—Ψ 140 om. it., add. im. P. Soc. It. 140. Wherever other papyri can be compared, this corruption does not of course appear.¹¹

With the exception of a single passage to be discussed later, my list (pp. 8-12) of passages to be judged interpolations because of the manuscript evidence is tested but at seven points:

4p Oxy XI 1389 | 355-371 5p Soc It II 114 | Θ 1-22 49-52 63-65 95 98-109 111-120 128-135 139-144 150-163 173-192 2/3p P Brit Mus 736 | 451-456 486-491 4p Soc It I 10 | I 1-7 r BCH 28. 207 f. | 287-296 325-331 5p Oxy XI 1390 | 575-585 608-619 4p Soc It I 12 | K 199-221 237-263 3p Soc It I 13 | A 464-466 515-517 4p Soc It II 138 | 526-528 566-569 597-602 634-641 5p Oxy XI 1391 | 556-613 2p P Tebt 266 | 578-581 607-614 628-649 660-672 4p Soc It I 10 | M 3-16 23-47 53-63 136-140 166-170 4p Soc It I 10 | N 545-559 1p P Berol 11516 (Schubart, Taf. I) | 751-780 786-813 4p Soc It I 10 | O 303-325 3p Oxy XI 1392 | II 157-170 191-203 5p Oxy XI 1393 | P 102-115 142-152 P Rainer 533 (Führer p. 127) | Σ 76-99 (some inferred) 112-135 4/5p Soc It I 14 | 574-579 615-617 4/5p Mel Nic 222 | X 1-17 22-38 2/3p Soc It II 139 | 449-474 P Brit Mus 1811 | Ψ 63-88 93-97 126-147 152-156 3p Soc It II 140 | 485-491 499-509 2/3p Soc It II 141.

⁸ The editors consider the possibility of 'plus' verses in P. Tebt. 266, P. Oxy. 1391 which seems to me improbable. Accordingly, I do not now, as formerly (p. 128), regard P. Tebt. 266 as akin to the Ptolemaic text.

⁹ So also Ludwig's N^b; there can be no connection with Aristarchus' athetesis of vv. 55-56.

¹⁰ Editor does not see quite clearly, but the trouble was due to haplography from χέλρσαι to κύμασι.

¹¹ For A cf. P. Fayum 141, P. Greco-Egiz. 106, P. Berol. 9854, P. Ryl. 44, P. Bodl. a 1; for A P. Morgan; for H 358 P. Oxy. 547; for M 27/28, N 800 P. Morgan; for Σ 617 PP. Brit. Mus. 107, 127.

A 463* (P. Soc. It. 113), B 168 (P. Soc. It. 137), H 368-369 (P. Soc. It. 114), © 183 (P. Brit. Mus. 736), N 808* (P. Soc. It. 10), P 145* (P. Rainer 533) and X 10* (P. Soc. It. 139). All seven of these passages are omitted by these papyri. Six of them are omitted also by papyri previously employed: A 463* by P. Berol. 7495, and (probably) P. Greco-Egiz. 106; B 168 by P. Brit. Mus. 126 and P. Bodl. a 1; © 183 by P. Fayum 210; N 808* by P. Morgan; P 145* (probably) by P. Berol. 230; and X 10* by P. Oxy. 559. For the remaining passage H 368-369 papyrus evidence has not hitherto been available. The second list (pp. 12-13), in which the disturbance of the manuscripts is not so marked, is tested but at one point: © 6 is omitted by P. Brit. Mus. 736 as it was previously by P. Goodspeed 7. On pp. 22-23 I have given lists of lines omitted in papyri accidentally; wherever the new papyri come into question, they contain these lines. B 842 is found in P. Brit. Mus. 886; A 560, 595' in P. Tebt. 266; Σ 132 in P. Soc. It. 14; Σ 577 in P. Mel. Nic.; and A 178 in P. Freib. 5.

So far then the new evidence has conformed to my theory exactly, and there remains but one passage. Nestor in telling Patroclus of the misfortune of the Greeks says:

Α 660 βέβληται μὲν ὁ Τυδείδης κρατερὸς Διομήδης,
οὔτασται δ' Ὀδυσσεὺς δουρικλυτὸς ἤδ' Ἀγαμέμνων·
βέβληται δὲ καὶ Εὐρύπυλος κατὰ μηρὸν δίστοφ—

and the same words are afterwards (II 25-27) used by Patroclus to Achilles. Now in II the last line makes difficulty enough;¹² but in A it is obviously much worse, and there it is generally regarded as a late intruder from II. There is nothing to show that the scholiasts knew the line in A, while according to Duentzer, *Hom. Abh.* p. 65, it is ignored even by Eustathius. The manuscript evidence for it here is slight, consisting according to Ludwig only of J, a thirteenth-century manuscript, and of others still later. Under these circumstances it was surprising to find the line in P. Morgan, and it is still more surprising to find it again in P. Soc. It. 10. The disturbance in the manuscripts is too great to permit the explanation that the interpolation was made at an extremely early date, and had become

¹² Cf. most recently Wilamowitz, *Die Ilias und Homer*, p. 118.

fairly wide-spread by the fourth century. Personally I believe that a whim of fortune has here saved for us two representatives of a small minority, while leaving the majority unrepresented;¹³ others may see in this a mere cutting of the knot.

In this connection I should like to point out an additional reason for believing that in about 150 B. C. there was a revolution in the publication of the Homeric text. The fact, first observed by Grenfell and Hunt, *Hibeh Papyri*, pp. 67-75, that the text then changes suddenly from a longer to a shorter version, is now generally recognized. The papyrus evidence strongly indicates also that the new text introduced a new peculiarity of form—the division of each poem into twenty-four books. After 150 B. C. there are a number of papyri which show the book division exactly as it is familiar to us; while, so far as my memory serves, there is not one for which we have reason to believe that its text was not so divided. Before that date the situation is reversed. Of earlier papyri, seven (eight if the Rylands papyrus of Π is distinct) have been published, and in none is there a trace of the division into books. On the contrary, there is no division between Λ and M in the Geneva papyrus, nor between X and Ψ in P. Hibeh 22; while in P. Hibeh 21 considerations of space point strongly to the conclusion that H and Θ were similarly joined. I have shown that the new text came from the edition of Aristarchus, and it is natural to assign to the same source the division into books.

Whether this division is original with Aristarchus is another question. If so, I should not regard it with Ludwich, AHT II 220 n., as a crime, but as a service. There is a tradition which ascribes it to Aristarchus, cf. Wolf, *Proleg.* p. 256, and no cogent reason for distrusting it. The argument in favor of Zenodotus from the close of the Odyssey, cf. Lachmann, *Be-trachtungen*, p. 93, Wilamowitz, *Hom. Unt.*, p. 369 n., breaks down upon examination;¹⁴ and so does the argument from the close of H —cf. Lachmann, Ludwich, *loc. cit.*—against

¹³ Who would expect a papyrus to be published under the number of the line it accidentally omits? Yet P. Soc. It. 140 omits Ψ 140.

¹⁴ The notion that the text of Aristarchus actually ended with ψ 296 must be definitely abandoned. Had it done so, the vulgate would have stopped with the same line.

Zenodotus. In spite of the claims of Wilamowitz, *Die Ilias und Homer*, p. 32 n., the papyrus evidence is of no aid in deciding between Zenodotus and Aristarchus, although it is amply sufficient to refute those who hold that the book division existed *semper et ubique*.

When the papyri discoveries began it was natural to look, as Kenyon, Landwehr and others did, for a relation between omissions in the papyri and atheteses of the Alexandrian critics. The expectation found no fulfilment;¹⁵ and the subsequent reaction has tended towards a denial of the value of these variants. That tendency was aided by two facts: the papyrus evidence was rated piece by piece, and the significant omissions were obscured by the surface corruption. By setting aside the latter and by studying the problem as a whole I have previously shown a high degree of correlation between three classes of facts: 1) the significant omissions in the papyri; 2) fluctuations in the manuscript testimony; and 3) positive or negative indications that the lines were not in the edition of Aristarchus. The material here presented has tested this correlation severely; for the question has been whether the known facts of the second and third class would permit a forecast of the significant omissions to be found in papyri covering some 1500 lines. The test has resulted in a way which can, I believe, leave no doubt of the reality of this correlation. If so, it demands an explanation. The hypothesis that our vulgate began by agreeing line for line with the edition of Aristarchus, and afterwards suffered interpolation, is in itself most probable. It is, besides, the only one that can account for the correlation observed.

GEORGE MELVILLE BOLLING.

THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY.

¹⁵ Yet the hope has lingered, so that, as late as 1914, Aly thought it worth while to point out that P. Freib. 5 contained A 177, a line athetized by Aristarchus.

IV.—THE TIME-MEANING OF THE *TO*-PARTICIPLE IN VERGIL.

In June, 1918, the present writer had the honour of contributing to this Journal an article on the *to-participle with the Accusative in Latin*. Several scholars suggested then that a detailed investigation of the time-meaning of the same form in Latin writers and especially in Vergil would prove an interesting and profitable study. Thinking over Vergil, we recall many instances of the *to-participle* used with a meaning that we should certainly assign to the present tense:

(a) It is used to denote contemporaneous action, as Aen. ii. 220-1 ille simul manibus tendit diuellere nodos | *perfusus* sanie uittas atque ueneno; ib. iii. 256-7 uos dira fames nostraeque iniuria caedis | *ambesas* subigat malis absumere mensas; ib. x. 894 (Mezentius' horse throws his rider and pins him to the ground and then) *eiecto*que incumbit cernuus armo (the shoulder is dislocated with the fall); ib. viii. 407 prima quies medio iam noctis *abactae* | curriculo expulerat somnum; xi. 877 e speculis *percussae* pectora matres | femineum clamorem ad caeli sidera tollunt; ib. xii. 605-7 filia prima manu flores Lauinia crinis | et roseas *laniata* genas, tum cetera circum | turba furit (cf. Aen. i. 228, 481; xii. 65); ib. iv. 9 quae me *suspensam* insomnia terrent!; Buc. iii. 106 dic quibus in terris *inscripti* nomina regum | nascantur flores (the two actions take place together; the flowers put on, as they grow, as inscriptions the names of kings [see Amer. Jour. Phil. 1918, p. 190]); ib. i. 54 hinc tibi quae semper uicino ab limite saepes | Hyblaeis apibus florem *depasta* salicti | saepe leui somnum suadebit inire susurro; Georg. i. 494 agricola incuruo terram *molitus* aratro | exesa inueniet scabra robigine pila; ib. i. 293 interea longum cantu *solata* laborem | arguto coniunx percurrit pectine telas; ib. i. 206 quibus in patriam uentosa per aequora *uectis* | Pontus et ostriferi fauces temptantur Abydi; ib. iv. 120-1 quo . . . modo potis gauderent intiba riuis | *tortus*que per herbam | cresceret in uentrem cucumis.

(b) It is used to denote an attempted or repeated action, as Aen. i. 29 his accensa super *iactatos* aequore toto | Troas, reliquias Danaum atque immitis Achilli, | arcebat longe Latio,

where *iactatos* means 'continually tossed'; ib. iii. 125 *pelagoque uolamus | bacchatamque iugis Naxum* (cf. Georg. ii. 487); ib. viii. 368 *angusti subter fastigia tecti | ingentem Aenean duxit stratisque locauit | effultum foliis et pelle Libystidis ursae*; ib. vi. 22 *stat ductis sortibus urna* gives a picture of the lots 'being drawn.'

(c) It is used in a general reference, as Buc. i. 49 *non insueta grauis temptabunt pabula fetas* (*fetas* probably is derived from a 'participle' meaning 'those that bear'); Georg. iv. 139 *ergo apibus fetis idem atque examine multo | primus abundare*. Very similar is the common type in expressions like *uir laudatus* 'he who is praised,' 'a praiseworthy man' *inuictus* 'who is not conquered,' 'invincible.' We may compare exactly Skr. *śrutāḥ* 'famous,' Grk. *κλυτός* etc.

These are undoubted instances of the present meaning of the *to*-form; there are others in Vergil. Some, however, are not so obvious or so easy to appreciate; the most interesting of those we shall deal with below. This subject can by no means be reckoned among mere philological *minutiae*; for the right understanding of the *to*-form is often of high literary value and sometimes essential for the full appreciation of the poet. We must acknowledge from the beginning the difficulty of discussing tense; it is only less difficult than mood. Even in considering a real tense formative we have to take account of the meaning of the verbal root in special instances—whether it shows imperfective or perfective, progressive or instantaneous action. In the present thesis we are dealing with a form which originally had no connexion with tense and one of which we more or less understand the current uses in the various languages in historical times and of which we can conjecture the origin by a comparison of the languages; but of its intermediate history we know nothing except what can be gathered from uses in writers, which appear to be taken from an earlier stratum of the language.

The other Italic dialects and the earliest records of Latin itself afford no help; the general use of the *to*-form with a past meaning was already common in the Italic period. On the other hand in connexion with the so-called deponent verbs the *to*-participle has, as everybody knows, a freer use; it is quite *timeless*, and is as often present as past in meaning. Many examples of the present meaning both in the earlier poets and in prose

writers occur to us, as Plaut. *Amph.* 290, *Asin.* 640 (*complexus*), *Rud.* 560 (*amplexus*), etc., Cic. *Pro Murena* 30, and such pure presents as *incenatus* (Plaut. *Trin.* 473), *iuratus* (Plaut. *Poen.* 736, *Pseud.* 792, *Rud.* 48) and such adjectives as *cerritus*, *exercitus*, *ignotus*. The *to*-participle from deponent verbs occurs also with a past meaning from the earliest historical times, as Ennius (Ernout, *Recueil de textes latins archaïques*, p. 149) *hinc campum celeri passu permensa parumper | conicit in siluam sese*; cf. Vergil *Aen.* xi. 283, xii. 510, vii. 668, xi. 487. This freedom from tense restriction in deponents like their freedom in matters of voice (for the passive use cf. Plaut. *Asin.* 196, *Miles Glor.* 903, *Pers.* 465, 466, *Pseud.* 941, etc.) represents, no doubt, the original condition of the *to*-form. The Vergilian examples, which are quoted above, are exactly similar and, as we shall see, are of interest in the history of the form.

The foregoing examination of the time-meaning of the *to*-participle confirms what we know of its origin. It is not found consistently appended to any special stem or tense formation; it is in fact often added to mere roots, as in *datus* from **deto*-, *actus* from **agto*-, *rectus* from **regto*- etc. Moreover, as Brugmann has pointed out (*Indogerm. Forschungen* V. p. 92), the real perfect tense often has a different form from the *to*-participle; cf. *dedi* (*datus*), *egi* (*actus*), etc. The connexion between the *to*-form and the perfect tense in Sanskrit and the Italic languages was in the beginning accidental (cf. *Amer. Jour. Phil.* 1918, p. 186) and grew up gradually in course of time. Examples like *sensus*, *farsus*, *hausus*, etc. show formal attraction and have their origin in a later period. Further, the history of the suffix *-to*- cannot be separated from that of *-t*-, which we see e. g. in *comit*-, Skr. *samit*- etc., and from that of *-ito*- (e. g., Skr. *darśitāḥ*, Goth. *gatarhiþs*, perhaps Lat. *monitus*, etc.). In Greek the *to*-form remained independent of the verb as the numerous adjectives in *-τος* show, as *ἀγαστός*, *ἀγῆτός*, *λωβητός*, *ἀνάπυστος*, *βουλευτός*, *ἐπιστητός*, *θεατός*, *ιατός*, *ἀμφίκλυστος* (*ἀκτή*), etc. In Sanskrit too we have quasi-adjectival and timeless words ending in *-taḥ*, as *īhitāḥ*, 'aimed at,' 'desired,' *bādhitāḥ*, 'hard-pressed,' *labdhāḥ* 'obtained,' as well as pure adjectives such as *trṣṭāḥ* 'rough,' *śītāḥ* 'cold,' *dr̥dhāḥ* 'firm,' *ṛtāḥ* 'right,' etc. In the Italic languages also the *-to*- suffix is found with a good many adjectives, as Lat. *sanctus*, Osc. *saah̄túm*, Latin *certus*, Osc. *trutas*, Lat. *tacitus*, Umbr. *taḡez*, *tasetur*, etc.

At this point it may be possible to discuss some of the more difficult examples of the *to*-participle in Vergil from the point of view of the time-meaning. In many instances we shall gain much appreciation of the true picturesque effect, if we read the poetry with a proper understanding of the *to*-form and unprejudiced by the stilted grammar which we learned in our childhood. Let us notice some passages: at Aen. i. 480 *crinibus Iliades passis* *peplum . . . ferebant* | *suppliciter, passis* denotes imperfective action and means 'outspreading,' or 'flowing'; ib. v. 317 *limen . . . relinquunt* | *effusi nimbo similes* surely *effusi* is present in meaning and recalls to us the picture of the continuous changing movement of a cloud; cf. Aen. xii. 131; at Georg. iv. 337 *caesariem effusae nitidam per candida colla* similarly *effusae* is present in force and means 'waving'—the continual 'ripple' of their hair; at Buc. vi. 53 *ille latus niueum molli fultus hyacintho* | *ilice sub nigra pallentis ruminat herbas* the participle *fultus* is hardly past but rather imperfective (cf. Aen. viii. 368 quoted above); at Aen. ii. 693 *de caelo lapsa per umbras* | *stella facem ducens multa cum luce cucurrit* the participle is, of course, from a deponent verb; but it is a very good example of the present meaning; cf. Aen. v. 86 and iv. 395 (*multa gemens magnoque animum labefactus amore* | *iussa tamen diuum exsequitur*), where *labefactus* is exactly parallel and joined by *-que* to *gemens*; with the last example cf. Aen. viii. 390 where *labefacta* is present and passive; at Aen. iv. 666 *concussam* *bacchatur Fama per urbem* the verb and the participle are clearly contemporaneous; at Aen. iv. 589 *terque quaterque manu pectus percussa decorum* | *flauentisque abscissa comas* 'pro Juppiter! ibit | hic' *ait* the effect is enlivened if we interpret the participle as contemporaneous with *ait* and *terque quaterque* as merely 'several times'; probably too at Aen. i. 32 (cf. 333) *errabant acti* means 'they wandered under compulsion from time to time' that is *acti* is really imperfective; at Aen. i. 246 (the stream of Timavus) *it mare proruptum et pelago premit arua sonanti* the true reading is certainly *proruptum*, which means simply 'onrushing' and is present tense with a general reference. Such purely descriptive and timeless uses as Aen. x. 157 *Aeneia puppis* | *prima tenet rostro Phrygios subiuncta leones* are well-known and need not be quoted here. It is an interesting fact and a strong argument for the value of pure

linguistic study that we cannot fully appreciate in the literary sense the language of one of the greatest poets and perhaps the greatest literary artist of all time without knowledge of the older usages of the language. Not only in the *to*-participle but also in other matters we must revert to an earlier stratum of the language, if we would fully understand many of those turns of language which contribute so much to the poet's art. Vergil shows the same sensitive appreciation and understanding of the earlier language, as he does of the beliefs and customs of his remote Italian ancestors. If Philology and Historical Grammar can help us to a better understanding of a single verse of the poet, they are truly no longer to be regarded as barren studies!

The question naturally arises here as to how far Vergil's use of the *to*-form is archaic and how far a neologism. It is impossible to give any answer that can be supported by sure proofs, because, as we have already observed, there is no evidence of the continuous history of the form. The origin of the form and the comparison with its use in deponent verbs, however, make it fairly certain that Vergil's use is in origin at least an archaism. This is not the view of all grammarians and philologists; for instance Riemann and Goelzer in their discussion of the participle of deponent verbs (*Grammaire comparée du grec et du latin: syntaxe* p. 295) try to argue that the present sense often comes from the idea of 'entry into a state' and compare the Greek aorist with verbs of a perfective root meaning. From the point of view of the origin of the *to*-participle this seems entirely wrong. They have yet to prove that the present occurs only with perfective verbs; the examples which we have quoted from Vergil do not support such a theory and there is no ground for invoking the aid of analogy here! Vergil's use is rather a remnant of the loose unattached sense of the *to*-form.

CLARA M. KNIGHT.

UNIVERSITY OF LONDON, KINGS COLLEGE.

V.—DRAVIDIAN NOTES.

English often treats *n* and *l* as vowels: *hidn ridl* (written *hidden riddle*). Similar vowel-consonants were probably common in early Dravidian. A stressless vowel-*n* seems to have made *i* in Brâhui *sîr-* (await) < **sñd-* < **snuḍ-*, beside the stressed development *hur-* (look) < **snur-* < **snuḍ-*; and *ē* in Kurukh *ēr-* (see) < **hēr-* < **sēd-* < **sñd-* < **snuḍ-*, beside the stressed development in Malto *tunḍ-* (see) < **tunḍ-* < **stunḍ-* < **snunḍ-* < **snuḍ-*. The change of *n* to an oral vowel was presumably earlier than that of *sn* to *st* before vowels. Tamil has the same vowel in *nōṭṭam* (examination) < **snōḍḍans*, *nōkk-* (look at) < **snōḍg-*, as in *ōr-* (examine) < **sōr-* < **sñd-*; an early consonant-group produced shortening in Tamil *ottr-* (examine, look for, spy out) < **sortt-*, representing **sōr-* < **sñd-* combined with a *t*-suffix. From the derivatives of **snuḍ-*, **snūḍ-*, **snauiḍ-*, it appears that initial *sn* regularly gave Brâhui *h* < *hN* < *sN*, Gôndi *h* < *s* < *sN*, Kui *s* < *sN*, Kurukh and Malto *t* < *st* < *sN*, Kanara and Tamil *n*, Telugu *t*, Tulu *t* (with the dialectal variants *s* and *h*).¹

A vowel-*l* may be assumed for the root of Brâhui *hin-*, Gôndi *han-*, *ha-*, Kui *sal-*, *sa-* (go). Brâhui keeps *s* before dorsal vowels, as in *sal-* = Malto *il-* (stand); but *s* became *h* in *hin-* < **sln-*, corresponding to *h* < *sn* in *hur-*. The difference between Brâhui *sîr* and *hin-* shows that dorsal vowels were developed from nasals earlier than from *l*: the *s* of **sln-* became *h* after a dorsal vowel had replaced the *n* of **sñd-*. Similarly Sanskrit has *a* for vowel-nasals, but keeps vowel-*r* and vowel-*l*. The *i* of *hin-*, beside Gôndi *a* and Kui *a*, seems to have come from the closing-influence of nasality, as seen in the Brâhui pronoun *i* = Kurukh-Malto *ēn*, Tamil *jān* (I) < **ēn*. Gôndi has regularly changed *s* to *h*, so that we might assume *han-* < **hln-*, or *han-* < **san-* < **sln-*. But it is probable that Gôndi and Kui both developed **saln-* < **sln-*.

NORTH HAVEN, CONN.

EDWIN H. TUTTLE.

¹ American Journal of Philology, vol. 40, p. 84. *N* means voiceless *n*; *j* = Dutch *j*, Italian *j* in *aja*. A subscript dot marks reverted linguals. In my article on Dravidian *s*, the dot is lacking under *s*, p. 79, l. 17; under the *r* of Kanara *karte*, p. 79, l. 9, Tamil *aral*, p. 81, l. 18, Kanara *aral*, p. 81, l. 21, Tamil *ēru*, p. 82, l. 32, and under the *l* of Tamil *nīl*, p. 84, bottom. A length-mark is needed over the second *r* in l. 15 of p. 80, and over the first *r* in l. 12 of p. 81.

VI.—I. T.—TRANSLATOR OF BOETHIUS.

H. F. Stewart and E. K. Rand in the Introduction to their recent scholarly edition (1918) of Boethius' *Theological Tractates* and the *Consolation of Philosophy* incline to identify 'I. T.,' whose rendering of the *Consolation* they have used, with John Thorie, a Fleming born in London in 1568, and a B. A. of Christ Church, 1586. 'Thorie,' they assert, "was a person well skilled in certain tongues, and a noted poet of his times," but his known translations are apparently all from the Spanish.' In preparation at Cornell University for writing my Master's essay (1920), the *Consolation of Philosophy of Boethius in English Literature*, I found no reason to accept Thorie. I venture, however, to suggest John Thorpe, a noted architect and surveyor, who supplied the plans for the renovation of the house on the property that came to Thomas Sackville, the Earl of Dorset, in 1603. Now 'I. T.' dedicated his 'Five books of Philosophical Comfort' to the Dowager Countess of Dorset, widow of Thomas Sackville, who, he tells us, meditated a similar work. It is evident, therefore, that some connection existed between 'I. T.' and Thomas Sackville.

That Thorpe was a man of learning and ability in letters as well as a surveyor and architect may be gathered from Henry Peacham, who mentions him in the *Gentleman's Exercise* (ed. of 1634, pp. 172-3) as his especial friend, 'an excellent Geometrician and Surveior,' a man 'not only learned and ingenious himself, but a furtherer and favourer of all excellency whatsoever.'

A further clue comes through the delight we know John Thorpe to have gained in playing with his initials. Among his papers 'there is a curious design of a house built for himself, the ground-plan of which forms the letters I. T., connected by a low corridor, with the rhyming inscription:

"Thes 2 letters I and T, Joyned together as you see, is meant for a dwelling house for me. John Thorpe."'¹

Thorpe flourished between 1570-1610.

Accordingly, my hypothesis is that it was John Thorpe who translated the *De Consolatione Philosophiae*, perhaps as a diversion, and dedicated it to the widow of his former friend and employer, Thomas Sackville, in the hour of her bereavement.

INDIANAPOLIS, INDIANA.

G. BAYLEY DOLSON.

¹ *Dictionary of National Biography*, 56, 319.

REPORTS.

ROMANIA, Vol. XLV (1918-1919).

Janvier 1918—Janvier 1919.

Ferdinand Lot. *Nouvelles études sur le cycle arthurien*. I. Une source de la Vita Merlini: Les Etymologiae d'Isidore de Séville. II. La Vita Merlini source du Perceval de Robert de Boron. 22 pages. The mediæval writer did not use the classical authors directly, but through the mediation of the famous Spanish scholar. His work in its turn became the source of the late French prose romance.

Ernest Langlois. *Le traité de Gerson contre le Roman de la Rose*. 26 pages. This treatise is dated May 18, 1402, and it is one of fifteen documents bearing on the mediæval controversy over the celebrated romance. A Latin translation of this text is also extant and has been frequently published, the French original is printed here for the first time and three manuscripts have been used in establishing the text.

Arthur Långfors. *Jacques Bruyant et son poème la Voie de Povreté et de Richesse*. 35 pages. This rather mediocre imitation of the Roman de la Rose has been preserved to us in eleven manuscripts, one of which is now in the library of Mr. George C. Thomas of Philadelphia. This manuscript contains forty-six miniatures, and in 1909 it formed the basis of a privately printed book of great beauty.

C. Brunel. *Formes absolues et formes conjointes du pronom personnel dans l'ancien dialecte du Gévaudan*. 10 pages. The region here studied is in the Provençal territory of Southern France, and numerous charts have been consulted by the author.

Mélanges. G. Huet, *Les sources de la Manekine de Philippe de Beaumanoir*. A. Långfors, *Le dit de Dame Jouenne*, version inédite du fabliau du Pré tondu. J. Anglade, *Notice sur un manuscrit de Ugo d'Alvernia*. Giulio Bertoni, *Lettori di romanzi francesi nel quattrocento alla corte estense*.

Comptes rendus. A. Meillet, *Les langues dans l'Europe nouvelle* (Lucien Foulet). E. Tappolet, *Die alemannischen Lehnwörter in den Mundarten der französischen Schweiz* (Albert Dauzat). Kr. Nyrop, *Manuel phonétique du français parlé*, traduit et remanié par Emmanuel Philipot. 3^e éd. (Lucien Foulet). *Le roman de Phlorios et Platzia Phlore*, p. p. D. C. Hesseling (G. Huet). John Orr, *Les œuvres de Guiot de Provins, poète lyrique et satirique* (Arthur Långfors). F. C. Ostrander, *Li Romans dou Lis* (Arthur Långfors). Bertran de Marseille, *La Vie de sainte Enimie, poème provençal du XIII^e siècle*, éd. p. Clovis Brunel (A. Jeanroy).

Périodiques. Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen und Literaturen, CXXXII (1914), fasc. 3 et 4 (Arthur Långfors). Literaturblatt für Germanische und Romanische Philologie, XXXVII, 1916 (suite) (E. M.). Revue des Langues romanes, t. LVII (VI^e série, t. VII), 1914; t. LVIII (1915), fasc. 1-2, 3-4, 5-6 (A. Långfors). Romanic Review, I (1910), 1-4; II (1911), 1-4 (M. R.: La Romania est en retard pour rendre compte de cet intéressant recueil . . . Nous ferons effort pour regagner le temps perdu et pour assurer la régularité de ces comptes rendus . . .

Chronique. Irregularity of publication of the Romania was due to the war. Funeral of M. Paul Meyer, Sept. 11, 1917, with long list of commemorative articles. Death and biographical sketch of Emile Picot.

Collections et publications en cours. Bibliothèque de l'Ecole des Hautes Etudes (sciences historiques et philologiques), 212. Les aires morphologiques dans les parlers populaires du nord-ouest de l'Angoumois, par Adolphe Terracher; 1914, xiv + 452 pages.

Comptes rendus sommaires. 13 titles. The Gloria d'amor of Fra Rocaberti: A Catalan Vision-Poem of the 15th Century edited with introduction, notes and glossary by H. C. Heaton, Ph. D., assistant professor of Romance languages in the New York University. New York, Columbia University Press, 1916. Avril 1919.

J. Anglade. La rédaction rimée des Leys d'amors, ou les Flors del gay saber. 18 pages. The manuscript containing this disappeared during the Barcelona uprising of 1836, and it is only recently that it has been found again in a private library in Madrid. The entire poem comprises about 7500 lines, and it is only a few extracts of special interest that are here published for the first time.

Jean Haust. Etymologies françaises et wallonnes. 15 pages. The etymologies of six words and groups of words are here given, especial attention being paid to the group of words represented in French by Hure.

G. Huet. La légende de la Montagne d'Aimant dans le roman de Berinus, nouvelles recherches. 11 pages. The story in question is here traced back to India, and several German parallels in the Middle Ages are also cited.

Arthur Långfors. Dou vrai chiment d'amours, une nouvelle source de Venus la deesse d'amor. 15 pages. Critical edition of the text, preceded by a short introduction.

Lucien Foulet. Etudes de syntaxe française. I. Quelque. 30 pages. This article discusses the syntactical development of this common French word from the earliest times down to the present day.

Mélanges. Albert Dauzat, *Gaba et ses dérivés. Ernest Langlois, Manser. L. Clédât, "Ne garder l'œuvre." G. Bertoni, Una cobbola provenzale di un poeta italiano contro Carlo d'Angiò. A. Långfors, Une énigme dans le Liber fortunæ. A. Långfors, Simon, auteur de la Chronique de Floreffe. J. Druon, Anc. fr. Bémi.

Comptes rendus. Hugo Schuchardt, Die romanischen Lehnwörter im Berberischen (J. Jud). Max Niedermann, Essais d'étymologie et de critique verbale latines (J. Jud). Attilio Levi, Le palatali piemontesi (J. Jud). Maurice Grammont, Traité pratique de prononciation française (Lucien Foulet). Kr. Nyrop, Kongruens i Fransk (Lucien Foulet). Le Roman de la Rose, par Guillaume de Lorris et Jean de Meun, p. p. Ernest Langlois. T. 1^{er}: Introduction (Arthur Långfors).

Périodiques. Archivio storico sardo, tome XI (1915) (J. Jud). Giornale storico della letteratura italiana, t. LXV (1915, 1^{er} semestre), fasc. 193-4-5; t. LXVI (1915, 2^e semestre), fasc. 196-8; t. LXVII (1916, 1^{er} semestre), fasc. 199-201; t. LXVIII (1916, 2^e semestre), fasc. 202-4; t. LXIX (1917, 1^{er} semestre), fasc. 205-7; t. LXX (1917, 2^e semestre), fasc. 208-10 (A. J.). Literaturblatt für germanische und romanische Philologie, XXXVIII, 1917 (E. M.). Revista de filología española, t. I (1914), fasc. 2; I (1914), 3; I (1914), 4; t. II (1915), fasc. 1; II (1915), 2; II (1915), 3; II (1915), 4 (E. S.). The Romanic Review, III (1912), 1; III, 2-3; III, 4; IV (1913), 1; IV, 2; IV, 3; IV, 4 (M. R.).

Chronique. Obituary notices of Michel Bréal and Jean Druon. Publications annoncées. Collections et publications en cours.

Comptes rendus sommaires. 21 titles. Cornell University Library. Catalogue of the Petrarch Collection bequeathed by Willard Fiske compiled by Mary Fowler (M. R.: "publication méritoire"). Dantis Alagherii operum latinorum concordantie, curante Societate Dantea quae est Cantabrigiae in Nova Anglia ediderunt Eduardus Kennard Rand et Ernestus Hatch Wilkins quos adjuvit Alanus Campbell White.

Juillet-Octobre 1919.

Ernest Langlois. Remarques sur les chansonniers français. I. A propos de Gautier de Dargies. II. Perrin d'Angicourt et R 1665. III. Les trouvères Sandrart Chertain et Jehan Léger. IV. Hue le Chatelain d'Arras et les chansons R 140 et R 308. V. La chanson R 1135. 30 pages. The author of this article discusses various questions of authorship, textual constitution and literary criticism.

A. Jeanroy et A. Långfors. Chansons inédites tirées du manuscrit français 24406 de la Bibliothèque nationale. 46

pages. This new series of unpublished texts comprises thirty-three numbers and includes all the *unica* still remaining in the manuscript in question. These texts are given in a critical edition, together with strophic schemes.

H. R. Lang. The Spanish Estribote, Estrambote and related poetic forms. 25 pages. Professor Lang here publishes a critical text of a number of short Spanish poems, with introduction and notes. He pays especial attention to the question of paragogic *e* in Spanish.

E. Philipon. Les destinées du phonème E + I dans les langues romanes. 52 pages. This very long article deals with a great number of etymological problems, which are frequently elusive because of numerous gaps in our lexicographical knowledge of the older Romance dialects.

G. Huet. Charlemagne et Basin et les contes populaires. 18 pages. The author here gives a synopsis of five similar folklore stories from Eastern Europe, and states that the anecdote of the king turned thief is widely spread in that region. He suggests two possible solutions of the question of the origin of these stories and their connection with the well-known Old French variant. In a note at the end he gives some data on a similar Italian story.

Mélanges. Ferdinand Lot, Nouveaux exemples d'Igoranda. Ferdinand Lot, Ortivineas. Ferdinand Lot, Pour la chronologie des modifications phonétiques. L. Havet, Sorus, adjectif de couleur. Lucien Foulet, Le tutoiement en ancien français. Eugénie Droz, Notice sur un manuscrit ignoré de la Bibliothèque nationale (Imprimés, vélin 2231; XV^e siècle).

Comptes rendus. F. Lot, Etude sur le Lancelot en prose (Albert Pauphilet: "Le livre que M. F. Lot vient de faire paraître sur le *Lancelot* en prose est un des ouvrages les plus importants qu'aient inspirés les romans de la Table Ronde."). Maurice Wilmotte, Le Français a la tête épique (Lucien Foulet). A. Jeanroy, Bibliographie sommaire des chansonniers provençaux; Bibliographie sommaire des chansonniers français du moyen âge (Arthur Langfors). Les partures Adam. Les Jeux partis d'Adam de la Halle, texte critique avec introduction, notes et glossaire, par L. Nicod (A. Jeanroy). A. Steppuhn, Das Fabel vom Prestre comporté und seine Versionen; ein Beitrag zur Fabelforschung und zur Volkskunde (A. Langfors). The Ad Deum vadit of Jean Gerson, pub. by David Hobbart Carnahan (Eugénie Droz: "Cette édition du plus beau sermon français de Gerson est faite avec soin et conscience"). Étude sur Pathelin; essai de bibliographie et d'interprétation, par Richard Th. Holbrook (Lucien Foulet: "Dans ce beau vo-

lume, orné de vingt-trois illustrations empruntées pour la plupart aux anciennes éditions de *Pathelin*, M. Holbrook nous donne les résultats d'un travail poursuivi méthodiquement pendant bien des années . . . Le livre de M. Holbrook fait très bien augurer de son édition. Nous souhaitons qu'elle paraisse sans retard"). Béatrix Ravà, Venise dans la littérature française depuis ses origines jusqu'à la mort de Henri IV (Eugénie Droz). Maurice Jeanneret, La langue des tablettes d'exécration latines (J. Jud). Le fonti arabiche nel dialetto siciliano. Vocabolario etimologico comp. dal P. Gabriele Maria da Aleppo e dal suo allievo G. M. Calvaruso. Parte I. (Giacomo De Gregorio).

Périodiques. Bibliothèque de l'Ecole des Chartes. T. LVIII (1897)-T. LXXV (1914) (E.-G. Léonard). Bulletin de la Société des anciens textes français, XXXVIII, 1912-XL, 1914 (M. R.). Butlletí de dialectologia catalana, t. III (1915), fasc. 1-2 (J. Jud). Lares, Bullettino della Società di etnografia italiana, t. III (1914)-t. IV (1915), fasc. 1 (J. Jud). The Romanic Review, V (1914)-VI (1915) (M. R.). Annales du Midi, XXIII (1911)-XXXI (1919) (A. J.). Mémoires de la Société de linguistique de Paris, t. XVI (1910-11)-XX (1918) (M. R.). Bulletin de la Société de linguistique de Paris, t. XV (no. 56, 1908)-t. XXI (nos. 66-67, 1918-19) (M. R.). Literaturblatt für germanische und romanische Philologie, XXXIX, 1918 (E. M.).

Chronique. Obituary notices of Jean Bonnard, Léopold Constans, Charles Kohler, Ernesto Monaci, Egidio Gorra, Per Adolf Geijer and Pier-Enea Guarnerio. A. Terracher has been appointed to the chair of the History of the French language at the University of Strasbourg. Collections et publications en cours.

Comptes rendus sommaires. 29 titles. A bibliography of mediaeval French literature for college libraries by Lucien Foulet. The use of the infinitive instead of a finite verb in French, by Benjamin F. Luker. Essai sur l'histoire du vers français, par Hugo Thieme.

Official obituary of Paul Meyer by M. R.

GEORGE C. KEIDEL.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

RIVISTA DI FILOLOGIA E DI ISTRUZIONE CLASSICA. Vol. XLVIII (1920), parts 3, 4.

Pp. 321-342. Studi Senofontei. IV. Intorno all' 'Economico.' (1) La composizione. Luigi Castiglioni. The repe-

titions and inconsistencies of the *Oeconomicus* are probably due to the plan of the work, not to an interpolator. That is, when writing the first dialogue, between Socrates and Critobulus, Xenophon apparently did not contemplate adding the second dialogue, between Socrates and Ischomachus.

Pp. 343-353. Note critiche. Vincenzo Costanzi. Textual notes on Diodorus, XIX 67, 4; Polybius, III 118, 1-3; Livy, XXI 31, 4; Antoninus Liberalis, 72. In XXI 31, 4, Livy probably wrote 'Arar,' not 'Isara'; cp. Sil. Ital. III 452, XV 502-509.

Pp. 354-358. Il ritmo oratorio negli storici latini. Remigio Sabbadini. Comment on A. W. de Groot's recent study of the clausulae in Caesar and Sallust. Sabbadini is very sceptical as to the conscious use of rhythmical clausulae by any Roman historian.

Pp. 359-377. Studi sull' accento greco e latino. VIII. La lettura dei versi. M. Lenchantin De Gubernatis. A protest against reading classical poetry according to the ictus. Apparently, a plea for reading according to grammatical accent.

Pp. 378-384. Ancora poche parole per l'etrusca delle due iscrizioni preelleniche di Lemno. Elia Lattes. Postilla di replica. Luigi Pareti.

Pp. 385-389. *Ambages* in Petronio e in Dante. Ettore Stampini. Dante's expression for the Romances of the Round Table, 'Arturi regis ambages pulcerrimae' (De Vulg. Eloq. I 10, 2) has its parallel in Petronius, 118, 6, 'sed per ambages deorumque ministeria,' etc. That is, 'ambages' means 'fiction,' or 'fancy'; cp. Horace, A.P. 151, atque ita mentitur, sic veris falsa remiscet, etc.

Pp. 390-391. Postilla Manzoniiana (*Il cinque maggio*, vv. 10 sgg.). C. O. Zuretti. Manzoni's expression 'orma di piè mortale' has a classical parallel in Euripides, Orest. 1468 (τὸ χρυσεοσάνδαλον ἶχνος). 'Orma di piè' means merely 'piè.'

Pp. 392-394. Note all' *Elettra* di Euripide. Giuseppe Amendola. In line 978 the MS reading should be retained, τῷ δαὶ πατρίαν διαμεθίης τιμωρίαν; "To whom, then, would you entrust the task of avenging your father?" In 1014, γλώσση πικρότης ἐνεστί τις, the πικρότης is not that of the woman compassed by ill fame, but that of her detractors. The text of 1068 should be kept unchanged.

Pp. 395-406. Reviews and book notices: Cicero's Orator, edited by E. Stampini, 1920; The Oxyrhynchus Papyri, Part XIV; Pearl C. Wilson, Wagner's Dramas and Greek Tragedy, 1919; etc.

Pp. 407-413. Reports of classical periodicals.

Pp. 414-416. List of new books received.

Pp. 417-443. Sui 'Caratteri' di Teofrasto. Augusto Rosagni. The Characters of Theophrastus may be regarded as a supplement to the general treatises on poetics. They were written as a guide and help in character-drawing.

Pp. 444-448. Di alcuni fenomeni di aspirazione e un epigramma di Catullo. M. Lenchantin De Gubernatis. The pronunciation 'chommoda,' Catull. 84, 1, was dialectic, an example of 'rustica asperitas' or 'peregrina insolentia' (Cic. De Or. 3, 12, 44).

Pp. 449-468. Le fonti della silloge scoliastica Filargiriana. Gino Funaioli. Concluded from pp. 214-238. The principal source was, apparently, Donatus.

Pp. 469-474. Vestigium pedis. Adolfo Gandiglio. Cp. pp. 390-391. Manzoni's expression 'orma di piè mortale' has its parallel in Ovid, Met. 2, 852-3, 'quam nec vestigia duri | calcavere pedis.'

Pp. 475-495. Studi Senofontei. IV. Intorno all' 'Economico.' Luigi Castiglioni. Textual notes.

Pp. 496-504. Reviews and book notices.

Pp. 505-511. Reports of classical periodicals.

Pp. 512-516. List of new books received.

W. P. MUSTARD.

REVIEWS.

Die Ilias und Homer. Von ULREICH VON WILAMOWITZ-MOELLENDORFF. Berlin, Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1916. 523 pp. 8°.

This book—the story of its genesis is told in the opening pages—presents the conclusions reached after thirty years' study of the problem by a man who has long been ranked among the foremost Hellenists of the world. As was to be expected, it is a work that cannot be disregarded by anyone who is sincerely interested in the origins of the Homeric poems. Its conclusions, however, are presented, not in relation to opinions previously held upon the question, but merely as *aperçus* of the author. That is the chief defect of the book recognized by the author himself and ascribed to the wartimes which provided the only possible excuse, "for going my way straight to the goal, without looking much to right or left"—that is, for ignoring other writings on the subject. The result is to increase the dogmatic tone which is not entirely absent from Wilamowitz' other writings; but one who can guard his freedom of thought against this will find in the book much that is stimulating and helpful along with many conclusions from which I think it necessary to dissent.

To the reviewer whose space is necessarily limited the book presents an exceptionally difficult problem. Previous investigators have usually begun with an effort to define the nucleus of the poem. Wilamowitz proposes to start from the other end, and remove the later accretions layer by layer. The comparison with the systematic excavation of an archeologic site is present (p. 24) in his mind, and I may continue the comparison to express my general impression of his book. It is as if the work had progressed unequally in different parts of the field; the excavation being carried down at points to bedrock, while elsewhere the excavator has stopped among the upper strata, hesitating to disturb the beauty of what he has found. The result is on the one hand a clearer understanding and better appreciation of the topmost strata, but on the other hand confusion about the earlier strata and misinterpretation of the history of the site as a whole. To report fully upon the excavation would mean to write another book of at least equal bulk, and I must go to the other extreme and merely indicate briefly a few matters that seem to me of the greatest moment.

I may single out in the first place the attention regularly given to the problems of the "lower" criticism as a characteristic which makes Wilamowitz' book contrast favorably with other recent works on the same subject. In connection with this is to

be noted the excellent account (pp. 4-8) of the origin of our text. On the main point "*unser Text ist eine Revision, die im zweiten Jahrhundert v. Chr. unter Zuziehung von Handschriften gemacht ist*" I can agree with the author, though I believe that it is now possible to be more detailed and precise. I must admire also the neatness with which he draws the practical conclusion: "*Es ist daher verzweifelt naiv, wenn man sich wundert, wie eine bare Interpolation sich 'in allen Handschriften' befinden könnte.*" It is true that this text of Aristarchus is a revision of that of Aristophanes, but that is not a sufficient reason for simply obliterating the difference by *Aristarchus das heisst Aristophanes* (p. 121) and similar formulae. It is a service, however, when the author very properly emphasizes (p. 6) the folly and injustice of allowing our judgment of Zenodotus to be biased by the one-sided nature of the reports of his edition which have reached us. Before Zenodotus there was no vulgate, only a chaos (p. 7), "*eine Masse ganz gewaltig abweichender Handschriften.*" To that I would agree in a certain sense, though I would not go so far as to believe with Wilamowitz (p. 12) that there were in the library of Alexandria manuscripts of the *Odyssey* that ended with ψ 296 and contained therefore as a matter of course another version of the poem—one in which Laertes was dead, and the parts referring to him were missing. The proof of "*die Jugend unserer Odyssee*" drawn (p. 5 n.) from the agreement of P. Rylands 53 with our manuscripts is anything but cogent. If any conclusion is to be drawn it is that our manuscripts, or families of manuscripts, descend from an archetype or archetypes but little older than this papyrus. We have good reason to be grateful to the Alexandrians, but we must always remember (p. 8) that our text is only a selection made by them from a mass of variants, between which—as far as they are reported—we have a perfect right to choose.

Behind this there is to my mind another unity—the Attic edition of Homer. To such an idea Wilamowitz is opposed. The question of the *μεταχαρακτηρισμός* is not discussed; it is swept aside in a single sentence (p. 8), "*So giebt es denn auch bei den Grammatikern keine orthographischen Varianten, die irgendwie für Alter, Herkunft oder Integrität des Textes von Belang wären.*"¹ An appendix (pp. 506-511) discusses Wackernagel's work without touching the questions really at issue. The unity to which Wilamowitz comes is a poem A-H Δ-O-

¹ I should agree rather with Thumb, *Handb. d. gr. Dial.*, pp. 320f., and Wackernagel, *Sprachl. Unters. zu Homer*, pp. 83ff. I may call attention to the variants at B 573 which can best be explained as arising from the confusion of ΔΟΝΟΕΖΑΝ and ΑΟΝΟΕΖΑΝ in an Attic manuscript. It is a type of error which could not be expected to occur frequently.

Patrocleia-Achilleis which he calls the *Iliad* of Homer and dates about 750 B. C., or rather it is this poem in a number of recensions. Of these he distinguishes one with a reworking of the *Patrocleia-Achilleis* by the author of ΣΤ made at a time when this section had not yet been embodied in the *Iliad*; a later reworking which has affected ΥΦ especially; a third with the substitution of Ω and eventually Ψ²Ω for the death of Achilles which originally closed the poem; and finally a fourth with the insertion of ΘΙΚ. Preferences of the rhapsodists are held to have determined which of these recensions should survive.

They have survived however in an interpolated form, and methodically the first step should have been the removal of these interpolations. Had that been attempted the result would have been a chapter corresponding to the first part of Blass' *Interpolationen in der Odyssee*. I must regret that this was not done—although it is easy to see how repugnant it would have been to Wilamowitz as an artist. Instead, the matter has been scattered throughout the work, frequently in footnotes; and apparently it has at times been neglected as too trivial.

Wilamowitz declines (p. 11) to be guided by linguistic criteria—and that is to my mind a decision that necessarily vitiates his work. For him the chief thing (p. 25) is his appreciation of differences of style, as a matter of *ἁλoγoς αἰσθησιs*. That seems to me an uncertain guide, and to be accepted only in the absence of other indications. It helps most in the top-most strata where the possibilities are fewest.

Thus his views on the section of the *Iliad* lying between H 322 and Α 1 are in my opinion substantially² correct; Bethe (p. 107 n. 1) reached independently practically the same result. In addition to more important questions these two scholars differ upon a matter of detail which seems to admit of a definite settlement. Wilamowitz proposes (pp. 52ff.) to regard the *Building of the Wall* (H 323-344, 433-465) as an interpolation; Bethe (p. 218 n. 4) argues against this suggestion. Neither uses the decisive argument: Thucydides (cf. Murray, RGE² pp. 312f., and the literature there cited) learned his *Iliad* from a manuscript in which these lines were not written. That shows we are dealing with an interpolation, though not necessarily with one that is post-Thucydidean in date. In claiming that it is non-Athenian Wilamowitz is at fault;³ he seems at fault also

² Note that Θ 489ff. is older than the beginning of Θ, and is afterwards (p. 184) so explained by Wilamowitz.

³ It is an interesting possibility that the interpolation is not all of one piece. According to Didymus *οἱ περὶ Ζηρόδοτον καὶ Ἀριστοφάνη καὶ αὐτὸς Ἀπιδραφχος* (cf. sch. T at 443 and sch. A at 452) athetized τῆς ἀγορᾶς τῶν θεῶν. According to Aristonicus the athetesis was defined as extending from 443-464, cf. sch. A at 443. That was a slip (it

in believing (p. 64 n. 3) that the recognition of this interpolation entails the rejection of I 346-356.

The most interesting part of the work and the one of most permanent value is that which deals with the ending of the poem. As far back as Heyne a difference of tone in the last six books of the Iliad was observed. The idea dropped partly under the charm of the poetry of X, partly because the *Slaying of Hector* was obviously a necessary part of the story. Later Robert suggested that the original end of the Iliad had been cut away and its place filled by a "Εκτροπος ἀνάλυσις. Wilamowitz too finds in the end of the Iliad a separate poem which he christens the *Achilleis*. There is similarity and difference in these ideas, and it will be worth while to follow them in some detail. Both scholars believe that their poems have been re-worked; Robert distinguishing three stages in the development of the "Εκτροπος ἀνάλυσις, and Wilamowitz differentiating the *Achilleis* of "Homer," the epos of the author of ΣΤ and a redaction most marked in ΥΦ. To begin with Υ Robert claims for his original poem lines 353-503, Wilamowitz likewise rejects the first 352 lines. Of the remainder he is hypercritical, but can make no further analysis beyond the unlikely suggestion (cf. Leaf) that the closing simile is the interpolation of a rhapsodist. I can see no need for going beyond the belief that the author of the *Achilleis* finds this part of his subject less congenial and has helped himself with borrowed material. From Φ both take two large sections: Robert 1-138, 228-304; Wilamowitz 1-136, 235-304; the juncture made by Wilamowitz being by far the superior.⁴ Wilamowitz picks up the old poem again in 520; Robert prefixes 515-517 to this line, an error due to his failure to follow Zenodotus in athetizing 538-539. Both continue without important break to X 166 from which Robert passes immediately to 208 while Wilamowitz makes the splendid suggestion that 166 199-201 208 is the proper sequence. From X 208-394 the two scholars are again in agreement.⁵

For the section from Υ 353 to X 394 substantially the same conclusions have thus been reached by two scholars, although they have approached the problem from different ends and with

should be 442-464) which was pounced upon by hostile critics, cf. sch. T at 464: ἀποπον γὰρ ἦν εἰπεῖν 'ὡς οἱ μὲν πορεύοντο' (442) εἰτα εὐθὺς 'ἴδμεν ἑ' ἥελιος (465). The athetesis thus corrected is reasonable; if it was based in part on manuscript evidence, these lines would be still younger than their surroundings.

⁴ Robert also omits 17-33 in consequence of what we shall see is a wrong determination of the scope of the poem; the other differences are of minimal importance.

⁵ Wilamowitz' athetesis of X 1-4 seems unnecessary; other questions in this book are of minimal importance and show more agreement than disagreement between the two analysts.

different criteria. In the midst of the clamor raised by the Unitarians about the unending divergence of the analyses the fact is worth noting; and it entitles us, I believe, to handle this reconstructed poem as a reality. As it stands it is a torso, and the question comes of how it is to be completed. Wilamowitz has shown that we have not (as Robert believed) reached the end of the poem, but that it ran on much as in our text to Ψ 257 and ended with the death of Achilles. The original ending has been sacrificed in order that Ω might take its place—the *Games* being a still later addition. That necessitated a reworking of Ψ, the elimination⁶ of the *ἀνκεία ἔργα* wrought upon the body of Hector.

The problem of the beginning of the *Achilleis* is abandoned (p. 181) by Wilamowitz; the most he will say is that it reached back, as X shows, at least to the Polydamas scene and must therefore have included a *Reconciliation*. More than this seems possible. When we picked up at Υ 353 the thread of the *Achilleis* we were in the midst of a battle. Before that must have come the opening of the battle, the marching forth of the host—a scene somewhat like the opening of Δ only with Achilles instead of Agamemnon as the central figure. Exactly what we require is to be found at the end of T, and I see no reason for refusing to follow Robert and accept it as part of this poem. Nor can I agree to the demand of Wilamowitz that the *Achilleis* must include a formal reconciliation with Agamemnon; we may therefore pass back immediately to the events of the preceding night. It is filled in our text by two parallel scenes (Σ 243-355) which describe the Trojan *agora* and the mourning over Patroclus. The allusion in X 100 to the first of these shows that we have here at least the substance of the *Achilleis*, whether it has been reworked⁷ as Wilamowitz (pp. 171f.) thinks cannot be discussed here. One more item must have stood in the poem—the revelation to Achilles of the connection between Hector's death and his own. Earlier in Σ we have such a scene, but this is the point at which the *Achilleis* is joined to the *Iliad*, and the attempt at further analysis must be allowed to rest.⁸

In other parts of the poem Wilamowitz' analysis has been much less successful. An instance may be seen in his treatment of the *Patrocleia*. The study of his book has not lead me to

⁶ That this had taken place was previously suggested by J. A. K. Thomson, ap. RGE² 147f.

⁷ The strangest thing is the absence of all reference to the slaying of Patroclus in the speeches of Polydamas and Hector, but that is true also of Hector's speech in X. Did the *Achilleis* here betray the fact that Patroclus fought in his own armor?

⁸ Note however the absence in Σ 35-127 of all expressions of a wish to save the body of Patroclus. In the original concept the scene took place after the rescue was effected.

modify my belief in the substantial correctness of Robert's analysis—except for the latter's attempt to show that the change of armor is an old motif. In that Wilamowitz is correct, and Bethe has made (pp. 80-86) an even better presentation of the argument. The curious thing is how slightly Robert's analysis is affected⁹ by this correction. Wilamowitz is also right (agreeing with Robert against Bethe) in ascribing Automedon and the chariot of Achilles to the earliest stratum; but the linguistic evidence against the Sarpedon episode is decisive. The attempt to find in the *Patrocleia* an independent lay I must regard as a failure.

Space forbids the giving of further illustrations, and I must content myself with recording my dissent from the proposition in which (p. 514) the theory of Wilamowitz culminates that A, the scenes relating to the gods in NEO together with ΦX and the first part of Ψ are the "*eigene Erfindung oder doch Gestaltung*" of a single individual.

Another feature of the work must at least be mentioned—the literary appreciations of certain portions of the *Iliad*. One can read them with enjoyment and with profit, even though he may not be in agreement with the author's analysis. As examples I may refer to the treatment (pp. 92-115) of XΨ¹ or to the paragraphs (pp. 161-162) that contrast the *Patrocleia* with the *Achilleis*; the treatment too of A, A and B may be noted especially. I would call attention also to the section (pp. 322-330) on the lay, the short epos, the epos, and the development of structural art in them and to the following chapter headed *Sage, Lied und Epos*.

The proof-reading was not too careful. There are, moreover, some *quisquilliae* which cannot be laid at the door of the printer. On pp. 45ff. the scene of the death of Antilochus is twice ascribed to the *Ilias Parva* instead of the *Aethiopis*, so also Robert, p. 165. "*Die alte Schale von Kamiros, auf der Euphorbos und Menelaos um Patroklos kämpfen*" (p. 144 n.) must be the one on which Hector and Menelaus fight over Euphorbus. On p. 185 the notes are wrongly divided—after what has happened to Croiset it may be expected that some Unitarian will find therein cause for cheap triumph. On p. 186 n. 2 is found: "*φηγός sollen wir uns gewöhnen mit Eiche zu übersetzen, nicht mit Buche, als ob es lateinisch wäre.*" The remark seems strangely out of date, until one notices that the rendering "*Buche*" is twice found (pp. 98, 99) in Wilamowitz' own work. The etymology of Σώκος (p. 191) should not have been printed after the publication of Bechtel's *Lexilogus*. Sarpedon is not, as stated on

⁹Read in II 64 (U. I. 1601) ἀρία τεύχεα and drop II 140-144 (U. I. 1657-1661) and perhaps II 796-797 (U. I. 1820-1821).

p. 214, wounded in M. The sentence (p. 258) "*Auch der Mangel der Gleichnisse weist in die spätere Zeit; sonst müsste die Odyssee primitiver als die Ilias sein, und der Demeter Hymnus primitiver als die Odyssee*" shows a lapse into Unitarian logic.

GEORGE MELVILLE BOLLING.

THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY.

The Stonyhurst Pageants edited with introduction by CARLETON BROWN (*Hesperia*, Ergänzungsreihe: Schriften zur englischen Philologie herausgegeben von James W. Bright, 7. Heft). Göttingen and Baltimore. 1920.

A hitherto unpublished fragmentary cycle of Old Testament plays, preserved in Ms. A. VI. 33, Library of Stonyhurst College, has been issued in *Hesperia* under the editorship of Professor CARLETON BROWN. The work has been in progress since June 1914, and was prevented from being issued by the outbreak of the war. The manuscript is mentioned in *Hist. Mss. Com. Report III*, Appendix p. 338 a. Fifty-five leaves have been lost from the beginning and five leaves between folios 120 and 126. Material is also lost from the end of the manuscript, the last folio preserved being 190. There is also some disarrangement of folios. What we have left is twelve pageants, as follows: of *Jacob* (fragmentary), 106 ll.; of *Joseph*, 1048 ll.; of *Moses*, 1584 ll.; of *Josue*, 552 ll.; of *Gedeon*, 310 ll.; of *Jephthe*, 292 ll.; of *Samson*, 392 ll.; of *Saul* (a few lines at beginning lost), 1445 ll.; of *David*, 690 ll.; of *Salomon*, 370 ll.; of *Elias*, 815 ll.; of *Naaman*, 1136 ll. The pageants are numbered and the editor conjectures that there have been lost from the beginning of the cycle pageants dealing with the familiar subjects of the Creation, the Fall, Cain and Abel, Noah, and Abraham. He also conjectures that the thirteenth pageant which fell in the gap between folios 120 and 126 dealt with the story of Ruth. The pageant of *Naaman* which ends the cycle is also incomplete, and the editor estimates that without regard to further plays in the cycle the eighteen provided for must have reached the enormous total of 13,000 lines.

On the basis of proper names scribbled on the manuscript and of dialect, the editor concludes that the manuscript belongs to Lancashire, the region where it was found. He has also made the happy discovery that the plays are based upon the Douay version of the Bible, a conclusion which must be regarded as

certain in the light of the use in the pageants not only of words and forms from the Douay text but the frequent use of the commentary which accompanies the text.

The fact that the Douay translation was published in 1609-10 establishes with considerable certainty a date earlier than which these pageants could hardly have been composed in their present form. On the basis of the occurrence of *it* for the newer possessive *its* and some other indications, he thinks it likely that the plays were composed not later than 1625.

The editor thinks in view of the well-known activity of the Catholics throughout Lancashire during the period referred to that the author was a Roman Catholic and suggests that the plays might have been written by a student from Lancashire at the English college at Douay, which was conducted by the Jesuits. This, of course, is entirely possible. The editor regards the pageants as a curiously belated survival of an earlier form of drama, and thinks that although the author wrote with an audience in view and with a knowledge of the traditional manner of mystery plays, he was probably composing plays *de novo*, endeavoring merely to give a faithful dramatization of the chief events in the Old Testament. It must, however, be remembered that these plays are from the exact location in England from which come records of the latest performances of Corpus Christi plays. Weever, *Funeral Monuments* (p. 373), speaks of a "Corpus Christi play in my countrey, which I have seene acted at Preston, and Lancaster, and last of all at Kendall, in the beginning of the raigne of King James; for which the Townesmen were sore troubled; and upon good reasons the Play finally suppress, not onely there, but in all other Townes of the Kingdome."¹ It will be noted that Weever speaks here of the trouble of conscience that men were under with reference to the Corpus Christi play and that the plays were finally suppressed. Presumably, there were those who sought to save them by removing from them matter offensive to the current taste. Certainly, such efforts were made in other places.²

If this cycle is an attempt to rewrite in a more acceptable form some older Corpus Christi play, it is certainly true that the text has undergone very complete revision and has been made to follow the Scriptures with meticulous fidelity. The editor points out, for one thing, the enormous extent to which the author has made use of the "Chorus" or "Nuncius," a use which seems to grow as the cycle progresses. In pageants XVI and XVII more than half of the lines are spoken by the Chorus—the chorus, he believes, discharging the somewhat for-

¹ Chambers, E. K. *The Medieval Stage*, II, 373.

² Chambers, *op. cit.* II, 111-12, 144, 148.

mal rôle of the expositor in the mystery plays.³ This was the case, especially, in the earlier plays such as *Joseph*, *Moses*, and *Josue*, where only such material as would be difficult to dramatize is put into the mouth of the Nuncius. But in the later plays, such as *Saul*, *Salomon*, and *Elias*, his function seems to be somewhat more than that of mere expositor. The suggestion that the author found it necessary to abridge his material to a greater degree as he progressed with the cycle does not explain the whole situation. He seems, rather, to be experimenting with the Nuncius as a dramatic device. Beginning with the pageant of *Moses*, he closes the action of each play (with the exception of *Naaman*, where the Nuncius does not appear) with a speech by the Nuncius, and in the case of four plays, those of *Gedeon*, *Samson*, *Saul*, and *David*, the Nuncius makes the opening speech as well. But more important than this feature is the use made of the Nuncius in *Saul*, *Salomon*, and *Elias*, where practically every scene is set off by the Nuncius. It looks as if the author were attempting to make the division between the scenes more distinct and took this means of doing so. It is possible, of course, that in the earlier plays preserved the author was following plays of a cycle now lost. It is also certain that, if the cycle is a redaction and not an independent literary effort, the metre, a septenary line, loosely rhymed in couplets, must be an importation of the writer, since all other cycles were composed in more or less complex stanzaic forms.

The following points seem to indicate that the hypothesis of a redaction is possible. The plays contain no controversial or propagandist material. There are no allusions to the saints or the Virgin and no interweaving of the elaborate story of the cross which characterizes other extended Old Testament cycles. This would indicate that, whether or not the author was a Roman Catholic, rather than a Protestant, the plays were written to conform to Protestant taste. There is, however, little opportunity to introduce theological instruction. So also, as the editor points out, the dramatic method employed by the author is, except for the Plautine form of the pageant of *Naaman*, the simple method of the older religious plays. There are no stage directions, no divisions into scenes, and the action is frequently shifted without warning within the limits of a scene.

*The editor detects echoes of the choruses of *Henry V* in the speeches of "Nuncius," particularly in such phrases as "you must imagine now," "you must suppose;" also he thinks there is a reminiscence of *Henry V*, 1, 2, in the pageant of *Jephthe* and possibly of *Othello* in the pageant of *Elias*. He admits, however, that these references are very vague. The use of many names from classical and romantic sources and the Plautine form of the play of *Naaman* render an acquaintance with contemporary drama on the author's part a certainty.

The task of comparing the Stonyhurst pageants with other English cycles is rendered impossible by the fact that the parts lost from the *Stonyhurst Pageants* cover almost the entire subject-matter of the Old Testament parts of the four English cycles. Even the Cornish *Origo Mundi* covers by no means so much ground. It is only in the play of *Moses* that we find a basis of comparison. And in that play the author has followed Scripture so closely that it is not possible to find any significant points of agreement. The French *Mistère du Viel Testament* also follows Scripture with a good deal of closeness and agrees with the *Stonyhurst Pageants* in presenting Jacob, Joseph, Moses, Balaam (Chorus in Stonyhurst), Samson, Saul, David, Solomon. It does not include Joshua, Gideon, Jepthe, Elias, and Naaman.

The grouping of subjects into certain pageants, however, follows the traditional Old Testament topics as presented in the service of the church, but since the *Stonyhurst Pageants* are more or less inclusive this fact has little significance. The stories told in the *Golden Legend*, for example, are the same, except for Naaman, as those in the *Stonyhurst Pageants*, although Gedeon, Jepthe, and Samson are merely "passed over in the *Golden Legend*." Everything considered, it seems at least possible that the *Stonyhurst Pageants* were written to take the place of older plays in a form so faithful to Scripture that they would give no offense to current taste, and that they may have back of them an original cycle, which, however, they resemble only in a very general way.

HARDIN CRAIG.

THE STATE UNIVERSITY OF IOWA.

Etruskische Malerei, by FRITZ WEEGE. Max Niemeyer-Verlag, Halle, 1921.

In spite of the fact that a great mass of literature on the Etruscan question has fallen into dusty neglect in the libraries, we are still in need of special studies on every branch of Etruscan archaeology. WEEGE's book, attractively printed and bound, with more than a hundred full-page plates and nearly as many cuts inserted in the text, can not fail to be welcomed with joy. The title is somewhat misleading, for the author has confined his detailed discussion to the tomb paintings of Corneto-Tarquini, where he recognizes a local school in existence from the sixth to the second century B. C. It is disappointing to find no mention of the vase decoration which flourished still earlier in the same place. One chapter is devoted to the distinguishing quali-

ties of Etruscan art in general, and one to the technique and dating of the Cornetan frescoes; four others contain discussions of Etruscan history, manners and customs, while the longest of all describes the circumstances under which the tombs were discovered. All this is interesting and is enlivened by the author's evident enthusiasm for his subject; but it is disappointing to the eager seeker after fresh knowledge of Etruscan painting to find that less than one-third of the text deals with that subject. The plates are of permanent value, but the text is too general in scope to be of first-rate importance to scholars. WEEGE has allied himself with those who believe that the Etruscans migrated to Italy from Asia. On the question of their early relations with Rome, he declares his opinion plainly when he counts as Etruscan the bronze wolf made in Rome in the sixth century, "einer Zeit in der Rom etruskisch war."

LOUISE E. W. ADAMS.

NORTHAMPTON, MASS.
JUNE, 1921.

Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des Kaisers Septimius Severus.
By JOHANNES HASEBROEK. Heidelberg: Carl Winter
(1921). Pp. viii and 201.

This study is largely concerned with the outward acts of Septimius Severus, his political and military activities and the chronology of them. It will prove very useful for reference to them. A thorough-going search of the sources, ancient and modern, has been made, including coins, papyri, and inscriptions which, if of any significance, are printed in full in a special appendix. Unfortunately, HASEBROEK failed to see, until his book was in the printer's hands, Maurice Platnauer's "The Life and Reign of Septimius Severus" (1918), and has not read an article by the same man on "The Defeat of Niger," in the *Journal of Roman Studies* (1918), and the same topic in my "Studies in the History of Syria" (1915).

Comment on minor errors would be out of place in a brief review, and there are not many of them. A major error, it seems to the reviewer, is made again and again in wholly subjective estimates of the historical value of various statements in the *Vitae*. It is to be regretted that the author did not see fit to extend his studies to take in the new policies of this critical reign. While collecting so much good source material, he has omitted an assembling, from Justinian's *Corpus*, of laws passed by Severus. These and the great figure of the jurist Papinian scarcely find mention.

G. A. HARRER.

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA.

La Scrittura Latina nell'Età Romana . . . con Appendice bibliografica (32 Illustrazioni). LUIGI SCHIAPARELLI. Como 1921, Ostinelli di Cesare Nani e Co. Price in Italy 20 lire; for abroad, 20 gold francs. Pp. 207.

This is Vol. I of the new *Auxilia ad Res Italicas Medii Aevi exquirendas in usum scholarum instructa et collecta*: SCHIAPARELLI, the learned and prolific Professor of Palaeography and Diplomatics at the Florence Institute of Higher Studies, is also to edit Vol. II (*Raccolta di Documenti Latini, fasc. I, dal II sec. a. C. al VII sec. d. C.*). The series is dedicated to the fostering of historical studies in the New Italy; but Vol. I appeals to all students of the history of writing. It is a full account, with exhaustive bibliography, lists of MSS, fragments, etc. of all our sources for the study of early book-hands. SCHIAPARELLI concludes that from the archaic monumental capital are derived the elegant and the rustic monumental capital, and the cursive monumental capital and majuscule hands. The former passed over into books, the latter into documents. So in MSS we find the elegant and the rustic capital, in charters the cursive capital and majuscule (Pompeian and Dacian wax tablets). This last develops into the cursive minuscule. Mixed forms now arise—semi-cursive capital (papyrus de bello Actiaco), majuscule (Ulpian (?) fragment in Fayûm Towns, Plate V, No. X) and minuscule (glosses of Bembine Terence); archaic or rustic semi-uncial (*Oxyrhynchus Livy epitome*); and from this last, the uncial and semi-uncial book-hands. He combats the theory of Giry and Grand, and Traube, that the semi-uncial is a Christian development. The illustrations are taken from Wessely, etc.; there are numerous tables of forms of letters. The bibliography is admirable, and mentions several recent items new to most of us. The book is a thoughtful and valuable contribution to the critique of Latin palaeography.

CHARLES UPSON CLARK.

NORTH HATLEY, QUEBEC.

Cicero: A Biography. By TORSTEN PETERSSON. University of California Press, 1920. 699 pp.

New biographies of Cicero are coming out in rapid succession but what we really need still fails to appear. The general reader deserves to have a book cast in the mold—somewhat enlarged—of Strachan-Davidson's biography but with more generous attention to Cicero's literary work. The advanced scholar

needs as a convenient reference book a work of far larger compass than Sihler's containing the results of all important investigations that are pertinent and a full array of sources and authorities. Dr. PETERSSON's volume, good as it is in many respects, satisfies neither need. It does not reveal the maturity of judgment in political matters, the direct contact with all the diverse literary activities of this far-reaching author, nor the capacious style that either work would demand. As a work of reference it lacks, despite its meticulous care in many details, the final penetrating investigation, and the guideposts directing to sources.

This is of course only saying that the author has failed to do the well-nigh impossible thing. In fact the book is nearer a success than any biography of Cicero that has appeared in a decade. The author has understood the serious nature of his task. He has tried to do justice to every side of his subject, and he has also recognized the importance of setting the biography in its proper social and political framework. His reading is wide and thorough, even if it has not led to any appreciably original judgments. His proportions are in general right, though at times he has let the verbose letters lead him astray into the repetition of insignificant details. He has been steadily fair in estimating the personality of a man who marred very great qualities by obtruding irritating foibles. In a word this biography is safe and reliable, and can be recommended for what it offers. It may not be wholly out of place to express the hope that the author will recur to this exacting task after enlarging the scope of his researches in Roman history and literature. He may yet provide the book which no one else has succeeded in writing.

TENNEY FRANK.

Traces of Matriarchy in Germanic Hero-Lore. By ALBERT WILLIAM ARON. University of Wisconsin Studies in Language and Literature, Number 9. Madison, 1920.

ARON finds in the Germanic Heldensage the same traditional sentimental tie between mother's brother and sister's son that Farnsworth found in the Old French Chansons de Geste, and he handles the material in much the same way. A similar relationship between nephew and maternal uncle is revealed by the familiar passage in Tacitus's *Germania* (XX). The third step in ARON's argument is, perhaps, better expressed by Farnsworth (p. 227): "The sociologists have shown that this preference for the sister's son, which is one of the main characteristics of the matriarchal state of society, is found only where Mother-

right prevails or has once prevailed." The above is, briefly, ARON's case for Germanic traces of matriarchy. It can be overthrown only by the adduction of some other and more reasonable explanation of a relationship, in the Germanic sagas, between mother-brother and sister-son so frequent and so peculiar that it can not be dismissed as a mere literary device or a caprice of romantic invention.

Neither ARON's idea nor all of his material is new, but his is the first comprehensive and convincing collection of the Germanic literary evidence. However, his general discussion of matriarchy (one-fourth of the book) suffers somewhat from a vagueness and a dependence that are only partially excused by the difficulties of the matriarchal controversy and the scope of the present work. He neither accepts nor rejects the evident fact that if matriarchy was ever an Indo-European institution it must have been displaced by patriarchy so thoroughly and so long before the separation that the former could not have been transmitted to the Germans from that source. And he fails to suggest the strong probability that wherever matriarchy appears in the individual I.-E. peoples it is due to the emergence of an autochthonous, non-I.-E. substratum.

The book ends with a clever *non sequitur*, directed against the use of matriarchy as evidence of the non-Indo-Europeanness of the Picts. ARON argues that if matriarchy existed among the Germans centuries before Christ, it may also have existed among their neighbors, the Celts, before the Celtic invasions of Britain. Consequently, the matriarchy of the Picts is in itself no indication that they were not Celts.

But neither among the Germans, the Celts, nor any other I.-E. people do more than traces of an alien matriarchy appear, whereas that social organization was characteristic of the Picts and of various non-I.-E. peoples with whom the Indo-Europeans early came into contact (Iberians, Basques, Etruscans, etc.).

HAROLD H. BENDER.

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

Buell (Llewellyn M.) *King Richard the Second.* (The Yale Shakespeare.) New Haven, *Yale University Press* (London, Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press), 1921.

Canby (Henry Seidel). *The Tragedy of Antony and Cleopatra.* (The Yale Shakespeare.) New Haven, *Yale University Press* (London, Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press), 1921.

Dihigo (Juan M.) *Cómo puede conocerse la historia por las monedas. La Habana, Imprenta "El Siglo XX,"* 1921. 8°, 64 pp.

Hankiss (Jean). *Philippe Néricault Destouches, l'homme et l'œuvre.* Debreczen, *Hegedüs & Sándor*, 1920. 8°, 446 pp.

Harris (J. Rendel). *Celsus and Aristides.* (Reprinted from "The Bulletin of the John Rylands Library," Vol. 6, Nos. 1-2, January, 1921.)

Hemingway (Samuel B.) *The Second Part of King Henry the Fourth.* (The Yale Shakespeare.) New Haven, *Yale University Press* (London, Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press), 1921.

Inter-América. Español. Volumen V. Número 2. Julio de 1921. New York, *Doubleday, Page & Company.*

Jaeger (Werner). *Gregorii Nysseni Opera. Volumen I. Contra Eunomium libri. Pars prior. Liber I et II (vulgo I et XII^b). Bero- lini, apud Weidmannos, MOMXXI. 12 + 391 pp. 40 M.*

Judson (Alexander Corbin). *The Captives; or, The Lost Recovered.* Written by Thomas Heywood. Edited, with Introduction, Notes, and Glossary. New Haven, *Yale University Press* (London, Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press), 1921.

Milne (Mrs. Leslie). *An Elementary Palaung Grammar.* With an Introduction by C. O. Blagden. Oxford, *At the Clarendon Press*, 1921. (Oxford University Press, American Branch, 35 W. 32nd Street, New York.) 12°, 188 pp.

Peppler (Charles W.) *Comic Terminations in Aristophanes. Part V.* (Reprinted from *The American Journal of Philology*, Vol. XLII, pp. 152-161.)

Perry (H. T. E.) *The Taming of the Shrew.* (The Yale Shakespeare.) New Haven, *Yale University Press* (London, Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press), 1921.

Phoutrides (Aristides E.) *A Hundred Voices and other poems by Kostas Palamas.* Translated. Cambridge, Mass., *Harvard University Press*, 1921. 8°, 6 + 227 pp., \$2.50.

Sewanee Review (The). July-September, 1921. Sewanee, Tenn., *The Sewanee Review, Inc.*

Steele (R. B.) *The Book of Job.* (Reprinted from the *Methodist Quarterly Review* for July, 1921, pp. 523-534.)

Stemplinger (Eduard). *Horaz im Urteil der Jahrhunderte.* (= *Das Erbe der Alten*, 2. Reihe, 5. Heft.) 212 pp. 8°. Leipzig, *Dieterich'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung*, 1921.